



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

The Romanic review



LELAND • STANFORD • JUNIOR • UNIVERSITY

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO RESEARCH, THE PUBLICATION OF TEXTS AND
DOCUMENTS, CRITICAL DISCUSSIONS, NOTES, NEWS AND
COMMENT, IN THE FIELD OF THE ROMANCE
LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Edited by

HENRY ALFRED TODD and RAYMOND WEEKS

With the cooperation of

EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG

MILTON A. BUCHANAN

JOHN D. FITZ-GERALD

J. D. M. FORD

LUCIEN FOULET

JOHN L. GERIG

C. H. GRANDGENT

GEORGE L. HAMILTON

HENRY R. LANG

ARTHUR LIVINGSTON

KENNETH MCKENZIE

HUGO A. RENNERT

EDWARD S. SHELDON

HUGH A. SMITH

and of

The Hispanic Society of America

and

The French Institute in the United States

Volume X

PUBLISHED BY
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

1919

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.

285347

5

Y7A9BL1 09079AT2

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Chaucer and Seneca	HARRY MORGAN AYRES 1
El Lauso de <i>Galatea</i> de Cervantes es Ercilla	J. T. MEDINA 16
Eric's Treatment of Enide	W. A. NITZE 26
The Vision of Thurkill and Saint James of Compostella, <div style="text-align: right;">GEORGIANA GODDARD KING</div>	38
The Composition of the Old French Prose <i>Lancelot</i> (<i>continued and con- cluded</i>)	J. DOUGLAS BRUCE 48, 97
Doctoral Dissertations in the Romance Languages at Harvard University.	
A Survey and Bibliography	JOHN L. GERIG 67
Rabelais and the War of 1914	GEORGE R. HAVENS 79
The Tenth Tale of the <i>Heptameron</i>	MAUD ELIZABETH TEMPLE 83
A Note Concerning the "Vacant Stake" in Irish Folklore..	JOSEPH DE PEROTT 86
Some Theories of Irish Literary Influence and the Lay of Yoncc..	M. B. OGLE 123
The Descendants of Ganelon and of Others.....	GEORGE L. HAMILTON 149, 277
<i>La Vie de Sainte Euphrosine</i>	RAYMOND T. HILL 159, 191
Hispanic Notes: <i>asar</i> ; <i>asiago</i> ; B for U	E. H. TUTTLE 170
Etymologies and Etymological Notes (Rumanian).....	FELICIU VEXLER 171
Jodelle and Colet	H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER 173
Notes on Foerster's Edition of <i>Ivain</i>	E. S. SHELDON 233
The Dawn of Italian Culture in America	EMILIO GOGGIO 250
A Catalogue of English Translations of Spanish Plays, <div style="text-align: right;">ELIJAH CLARENCE HILLS</div>	263
Purgatorio XI, 2-3 and Paradiso XIV, 30	JOHN S. P. TATLOCK 274
The <i>Siège de Barbastro</i>	RAYMOND WEEKS 287
<i>Vair</i> and Related Words: A Study in Semantics.....	MURIEL KINNEY 322
The Teaching of French in Colonial New York City, ROBERT FRANCIS SEYBOLT	364

REVIEWS

<i>French Literary Studies.</i> By T. B. Rudmose-Brown, CAROLINE RUUTZ-REES	87
<i>El Genio de la Lengua y de la Literatura Castellana y sus Caracteres en la Historia Intellectual del Perú.</i> By Javier Prado (y Ugarteche), PHILIP AINSWORTH MEANS	95
<i>La Vie de Sainte Enimie de Bertran de Marseille, poème provençal du XIII^e siècle</i> édité par Clovis Brunel	A. DE VILLÈLE 178
Cecco d'Ascoli, <i>L'Acerba, con prefazione, note e bibliografia</i> , di Pasquale Rosario	JOHN PIERREPONT RICE 179
<i>A Study of the Writings of D. Mariano José de Larra, 1809-1837,</i> W. S. HENDRIX	182
<i>El Hispanismo en Norte América</i> , por M. Romera Navarro, JOHN L. GERIG	184
<i>French Terminologies in the Making.</i> By Harvey J. Swann...HARRY KURZ	278
<i>Etude sur le Lancelot en prose</i> , par Ferdinand Lot.....J. DOUGLAS BRUCE	377
<i>La Bella Mano</i> di Giusto de' Conti. Edited by Giuseppe Gigli.—Giusto de' Conti, <i>Il Canzoniere. Prima edizione completa</i> , a cura di Leonardo Vitetti	CHARLES E. WHITMORE 388
<i>Tutte le Opere di Dante Alighieri</i>	CHARLES E. WHITMORE 389
NOTES AND NEWS	190, 286
OBITUARIES	186

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

VOL. X. — JANUARY-MARCH, 1919 — No. 1

CHAUCEER AND SENECA

“SENECA” was a name to conjure with in the Middle Ages, not alone in the Romance countries, but thruout Europe. Whatever the question at issue, there is likely to be an effort, such as that of the advocate of communism in *Piers Plowman* (B. XX, 273), to “prove it by Seneca.” His name conferred dignity on several compilations not at all, or not directly, of his authorship:¹ a collection of *Proverbia*, taken in great measure from Publilius Syrus; a collection of short sentences culled from the genuine works and elsewhere, known as *Liber de Moribus*; a tract, *De Paupertate*, made up of longer citations from the *Epistles*. A treatise on the four cardinal virtues, *De Formula Honestae Vitae*, put together by Bishop Martin of Bracara († 580), was current under the name of Seneca, and was, perhaps, based on genuine material, as the good bishop’s *De Ira* clearly was.² Still another collection, *De Remediis Fortuitarum*, a “consolations of philosophy” in the form of brilliant epigrammatic retorts, is not wholly un-Senecan either in material or method.³ There was also the correspondence with St. Paul, the genuineness of which few cared to call in ques-

¹ For discussion of these supposititious works see E. Bickel, in *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, N. F. 60; pp. 505-51 (1905); Carlo Pascal, *Seneca*, Catania, 1906, and *Letteratura Latina Medievale*, 1909, pp. 117 ff.; Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 1911, pp. 109 ff.

² Several of these works were current during the sixteenth century in Latin, with an English translation opposite by the grammarian and “poet laureate,” Robert Whytton: *The Forme and Rule of Honest Lywynges*, 1546 (*De Formula Honestae Vitae*); *The Myrrour or Glasse of Maners or Wysedome*, 1547 (*De Moribus*); and *The Remedyes agaynst all Casuall Chaunces*, 1547 (*De Remediis*).

³ Cf. *Epistle* 78.

tion. With so much going about, in addition to a considerable body of genuine works, it is no surprise to find Seneca freely, and sometimes wrongly, quoted. Gower⁴ ascribes to him an utterance of Dante's and the author of the *Ancren Riwe* bestows the dignity of his name upon a commonplace injunction "esse rari-
loquos, tunque pauciloquos."⁵

Chaucer's acquaintance with "Senek," sometimes at one or two removes, is fairly extensive. The situation is conveniently summarized by Lounsbury:⁶ "Besides the account given of him in the *Monk's Tale*, his name occurs nine times in the writings of the English poet. In every instance but one he appears as an authority for some sentiment. No author, indeed, with the exception of Ovid, is specifically quoted by Chaucer with so much frequency, though to several he is under far greater obligations. It is to be added, also, that all the references to him occur in the *Canterbury Tales*. Outside of that work the name of Seneca does not appear, and it is doubtful if a single passage in the other poems can be traced to him with any certainty." The last statement must no longer go unchallenged, and it is the business of the present paper to show that Chaucer's acquaintance with Seneca outside the *Canterbury Tales* (in the *Troilus*, to be specific) is considerable. Meanwhile it will be convenient to assemble those passages in which Chaucer's acquaintance with Seneca is a matter of common knowledge.⁷ Even here it will be possible to introduce some new details.

The largest collection of references to Seneca is in the *Meli-*

⁴ *Confessio Amantis*, II, 3095 ff.

⁵ Mätzner, *Altenglische Sprachproben, Prosa*, p. 20; cf. Skeat's note to *Canterbury Tales*, H, 325.

⁶ *The Poetry of Chaucer*, II, 267.

⁷ First of all, I wish to lay a ghost which walks where it is likely to cause, and has already caused, some trouble. Miss Hammond, in her valuable and authoritative *Chaucer, a Bibliographical Manual*, p. 291, has erred in ascribing to Peiper in *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* (Fleckeisen's), vol. 97 (not 87), p. 65 (1868), a statement to the effect that traces of the reading of Seneca's tragedies can be seen in the *Monk's Tale*. Prof. J. E. Wells, in his excellent *Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, p. 709, repeats the statement. Peiper does not there mention the *Monk's Tale*. So far as his brief note concerns itself with the *Tragedies* and the *Canterbury Tales* at all, it contents itself with pointing out resemblances between the *Knight's Tale*, 2921 ff., and *Hercules Oetaeus*, 1622 ff., and K. T. 1625 ff., and *Agamemnon*, 260. The resemblances are of a general character.

boeus. This gives, of course, no indication of Chaucer's independent reading, since the quotations all go back ultimately to Albertano of Brescia's *Liber Consolationis et Consilii* (1246), but it exhibits a typical mediaeval situation which Chaucer unhesitatingly accepted. In the *Meliboeus* some twenty quotations are expressly ascribed to Seneca. Three of these, from the *Epistles*, are correct; one is really from the *Formula Honestae Vitae*; five from *De Moribus*; one ("if thy conseil is comen to the eres of thyn enemy, chaunge thy conseil," 2416) from an unidentified source; and ten are from Publilius Syrus. Besides, there are four quotations from the genuine works which are ascribed simply to the book or a "comune sawe,"⁸ and two genuine quotations, one of which is ascribed to Cicero, and the other, presumably through Chaucer's own misreading of the French intermediary text, to St. James. In all, there are five quotations from the *Epistles*. Of all the quotations in the *Meliboeus* only a little more than a third are genuine; and of what is genuine only a third is expressly attributed to Seneca. But all the passages that are both genuine and by Albertano of Brescia correctly attributed are from the *Epistles*.

Chaucer also gives evidence of being more familiar with his ground in the *Epistles* than elsewhere, even than in *De Ira*. In the *Parson's Tale* problems of source again detract from the significance of the situation, but in this high doctrinal treatise Seneca is the only heathen admitted to the company of Augustine, Solomon and Paul. Two sentences Chaucer ascribes to Seneca as he finds them in his source, represented by the *Summa Casuum Poenitentiae* of Raymund of Pennaforte, though Raymund gives the second of them (in his text the first) merely to Philosophus: "And lo, what seith Seneca in this matere. He seith thus: 'Though I wiste that neither god ne man ne sholde nevere knowe it, yet wolde I have desdayne for to do sinne.'/ And the same Seneca also seith: 'I am born to do gretter thinges than to be thral to my body, or than for to maken of my body a thral.'" (I, 144 f.) But in another pas-

⁸ One of these, l. 2518, from *Epistle* III, 3, Albertano ascribes directly to Seneca, Chaucer merely to "the book." Twice elsewhere, *C. T.*, E 1376, I 467, Chaucer quotes Seneca where his authority turns out to be portions of the *Liber Consolationis* not used in the *Meliboeus*.

⁹ For the Latin original see Kate O. Peterson, *The Sources of the Parson's Tale*, p. 11. There is nothing that I have found corresponding precisely to this

sage in the *Parson's Tale* we seem to have Chaucer's independent and first-hand adaptation of Senecan thought. Few of Seneca's utterances are more striking than his good word for slaves (*Ep.*, 47), and it is hard to believe from the evidence that Chaucer had not read the opening lines of this epistle: "And therfore seith Seneca: 'thy prudence sholde live benignely with thy thralles'" (*I*, 759).¹⁰ Miss Petersen (p. 68) quotes nothing from Peraldus' *Tractatus de Viciis* which could serve as the immediate basis of this passage in Chaucer, whose phrasing indicates acquaintance with the whole epistle:

Think eek, that of swich seed
as cherles springeth, of swich
seed springen lordes. As wel may
the cherl be saved as the lord.
The same deeth that taketh the
cherl, swich deeth taketh the lord.
Wherfore I rede, do right so with
thy cherl, as thou woldest that thy
lord dide with thee, if thou were
in his plyt. / Every sinful man is
a cherl to sinne. I rede thee,
certes, that thou, lord, werke in
swich wyse with thy cherles, that
they rather love thee than drede.
(*I* 761 ff.)

vis tu cogitare istum, quem ser-
vum tuum vocas, ex isdem semi-
nibus ortum, eodem frui caelo,
aeque spirare, aequè vivere, aequè
mori. (47, 10.)

sic cum inferiore vivas, quem-
admodum tecum superiorem velis
vivere. (11.)

'servus est.' hoc ille nocebit?
ostende, quis non sit: alius libi-
dine servit, alius avaritiae, etc.
(17.)

colant potius te quam timeant.
(17.)

Assuredly, someone, Chaucer or another, has here been reading Seneca, not merely culling a posy from a florilegium; that it is Chaucer and not another we should perhaps prefer to leave undecided until we have more evidence.

The *Parson's Tale* (§ 52) contains the story of the angry phi-
in Seneca, but the two thoughts, that sin is its own punishment, no matter how
successful, and that the body deserves consideration but should not expect
servitude, are expressed in *Epp.* 97, 14 and 14, 1. These passages are very likely
the ultimate sources of the quotations.

¹⁰ Libenter ex is, qui a te veniunt, cognovi familiariter te cum servis tuis
vivere. hoc prudentiam tuam, hoc eruditionem decet . . . 'servi sunt.' immo
contubernales. Note that in the next line Chaucer says that humble folk "been
contubernial with the lord" (*I* 760). Skeat calls attention to these resemblances.
The rest of the parallels above, except the last, which Skeat also notes, I am
responsible for.

losopher rebuked by the child he is about to punish, which bears a resemblance to a story told of Socrates by Seneca in *De Ira*, I, 15, But this I pass over as not likely to yield anything to our present purpose, and with it the three exemplary anecdotes in the Somnour's Tale (D 2017 ff.) which are also told in *De Ira*.¹¹ Stories of this sort may easily have reached Chaucer from some secondary source.¹² Probably of this origin is the Merchant's quotation of "Senek" to the effect that

a man oghte him right wel avyse,
To whom he yeveth his lond or his catel; (E 1523 ff.).

a subject which, as Lounsbury points out (II, 270), is discussed at length in *De Beneficiis*, I, 14-16, but which is also to be found in more epigrammatic form in Walter Map's *Epistola Valeri*, Cap. 9.¹³ Finally, the Senecan *De Matrimonio* is partly preserved in Jerome's *Contra Jovinianum* (I, c. 48). The Wife of Bath's fifth husband paraphrases part of it.¹⁴ Jerome's tract, as Skeat shows (V. 278), further provided Chaucer with some suggestions for the Pardoner's diatribe against gluttony. But in the latter passage Chaucer again seems to have been reading in the *Epistles*. Tyr-whitt noted the following parallel:

Senek seith eek a good word doutelees;
He seith, he can no difference finde
Betwix a man that is out of his minde
And a man which that is dronkelewe,
But that woodnesse, y-fallen in a shrewe,
Persevereth lenger than doth dronkenesse.¹⁵ (C 492 ff.)

. . . nihil aliud esse ebrietatem quam voluntariam insaniam. ex-tende in plures dies illum ebrii habitum: numquid de furore dubitabis? nunc quoque non est minor, sed brevior. (*Ep.* 83, 18.)

This instance is sufficiently clear to justify the quoting of further passages, not hitherto cited in this connection, to show how the

¹¹ I need not repeat details easily accessible in Skeat's notes.

¹² They are not in *De Ira* of Martin of Bracara.

¹³ See Skeat's note.

¹⁴ D 727-46. See Haase, *Supplementum*, pp. 28-29.

¹⁵ The substitution of the name Stilbo for Chilon, a few lines further on (603), may have been suggested to him by his reading in the *Epistles* (9, 18-19; 10, 1). This I feel sure I have seen somewhere noted, but cannot recall where.

Pardoner's discourse is shot through with Senecan thought, assimilated and adapted to the medieval context.

O, wiste a man how many mala-
dyes

Folwen of excesse and of gloto-
nyes,

He wolde been the more mesur-
able

Of his diete, sittinge at his table.

(C 513-16.)

O wombe! O bely! O stinking cod,
Fulfuld of donge and of corrup-
cioun!

At either ende of thee foul is the
soun.

How greet labour and cost is thee
to finde!

Thise cokes, how they stampe,
and streyne, and grinde,

And turnen substance into acci-
dent,

To fulfille al thy likerous talent!

Out of the harde bones knocke
they

The mary, for they caste noght
a-wey

That may go thurgh the golet
softe and swote;

Of spicerye, of leef, and bark,
and rote

Shal been his sauce y-maked by
delyt,

To make him yet a newer appetyt.

Multos morbos multa fericula fe-
cerunt. (95, 19.)

proba istas, quae voluptates vocan-
tur, ubi transcenderunt modum,
poenas esse. (83, 27.)

quam foedi itaque pestilentesque
ructus sunt, quantum fastidium
sui exhalantibus crapulam vet-
erem! scias putrescere sumpta,
non concoqui. (95, 26.)

quantum hominum unus venter
exercet! (95, 25.)

aspice culinas nostras et concur-
santis inter tot ignes cocos: unum
videri putas ventrem, cui tanto
tumultu comparatur cibus? (114,
26.)

omnia semel et in eundem sapo-
rem versa ponantur. quare ego
ad unam rem manum porrigam?
plura veniant simul, multorum
ferculorum ornamenta coeant et
cohaereant . . . pariter sint, quae
disponi solent, uno iure perfusa.
nihil intersit: ostrea, echini, spon-
dyli, nulli perturbati concoctique
ponantur. non esset confusior vo-
mentium cibus. quomodo ista per-
plexasunt, etc. (95, 27-29.)

qui postquam coepit non ad tol-
lendam, sed ad iritandam famem
quaeri et inventae sunt mille con-
diturae, quibus aviditas excitare-
tur. (95, 15.)

Nos itaque, ut ait Sallustius,

But certes, he that haunteth swich delyces	'ventri oboedientes' animalium
Is deed, whyl that he liveth in tho vyces. (C 534-48.)	loco numeremus, non hominum, quosdam vero ne animalium quidem, sed mortuorum . . . mortem suam antecesserunt. (60, 4.)

One more passage in the *Canterbury Tales* leads us to the *Epistles*: the Man of Law's lament over the passage of time:

Lordinges, the tyme wasteth night and day,
 And steleth from us, what prively slepinge,
 And what thurgh negligence in our wakinge,
 As dooth the streem, that turneth never agayn,
 Descending fro the montaigne in-to playn.
 Wel can Senek, and many a philosophe
 Biwailen tyme, more than gold in cofre.
 "For los of catel may recovered be,
 But los of tyme shendeth us," quod he. (B 20-28.¹⁶)

Skeat has pointed out the resemblance of this to passages near the beginning of the first *Epistle*:

Quaedam tempora eripiuntur nobis, quaedam subducuntur, quaedam effluunt. turpissima tamen est iactura, quae per neglegentiam fit . . . et tanta stultitia mortalium est, ut quae minima et vilissima sunt, certe reparabilia, imputari sibi, cum impetravere, patiantur, nemo se iudicet quicquam debere, qui tempus accepit, cum interim hoc unum est, quod ne gratus quidem potest reddere. (*Ep.* I, 1-4.)

To this I should like to add a passage in which Seneca deplores the loss of time through sleep:

Non tam benignum ac liberale tempus
 natura nobis dedit, ut aliquid ex illo vacet perdere . . .
 vitam nobiscum dividit somnus. (*Ep.* 117, 32.)

Chaucer again has Seneca in mind, amid much else, in the disquisition of Gawain's loathly bride on gentillesse:

Redeth Senek and redeth eek Boëce,
 Ther shul ye seen expres that it no drede is,
 That he is gentil that doth gentil dedis;
 And therfore, leve housband, I thus conclude,

¹⁶ Cf. *Troilus*, IV, 1283, "For tyme y-lost may not recovered be"; also III, 896.

Al were it that myne auncestres were rude,
 Yet may the hye god, and so hope I,
 Grante me grace to liven vertuously.
 Thanne am I gentil, whan that I biginne
 To liven vertuously and weyve sinne. (D 1168-76.)

This opens a large and interesting subject and in addition to several recent discussions¹⁷ of a most illuminating character on the contributions of the *Romance of the Rose*, of Dante, and of Boethius, to Chaucer's treatment of this widespread theme, more remains to be said than there is room for here. For the present it must suffice to record that Chaucer, in the passage quoted above is, of course, thinking of Seneca's forty-fourth epistle, though I do not find that any one has said so. I am convinced that Chaucer got something from Seneca, as well as from the others. The Senecan influence appears in the full and positive form in which Chaucer casts the thought, colored in him, of course, by Christian phraseology, that the practice of virtue is open to all, and that the practice of virtue, regardless of one's station in life, is the immediate and the only source of true nobility ("gentillesse"). This is fairly to be inferred from Dante's

È Gentilezza dovunque è virtute
 Ma non virtute ov' ella. (*Convivio*, IV, 1, 101 f.)

and from Boethius (2, pr. 6, 17-19)—the translation is Chaucer's:

And therefore it is thus, that honour ne comth nat to vertu for cause of dignitee, but ayeinward honour comth to dignitee for cause of vertu.

Both these passages Chaucer knew, but in neither is there so little concern with the negative aspect of the case, nor so unequivocal and so inclusive a statement of the positive as Chaucer gives at this point, or as Seneca:

bona mens omnibus patet, omnes ad hoc sumus nobiles . . . quis est generosus? ad virtutem bene a natura compositus. hoc unum intuentum est . . . animus facit nobilem, cui ex quacumque condicione supra fortunam licet surgere. (*Ep.* 44, 2-5.)

¹⁷ Dean S. Fansler, *Chaucer and the Roman de la Rose*, p. 220; J. L. Lowes, *Chaucer and Dante's Convivio*, *Modern Philology*, XIII, 19-33 (May, 1915); Bernard L. Jefferson, *Chaucer and the Consolations of Philosophy of Boethius*, 1917, pp. 94 ff.

The Wife of Bath's heroine quotes Seneca once more, on the subject of poverty:

Glad povert is an honest thing, certeyn;
This wol Senek and othere clerkes seyn.
Who-so that halt him payd of his poverte,
I holde him riche, al hadde he nat a sherte.
He that coveyteth is a povre wight,
For he wolde han that is nat in his might.
But that he that noghte hath, ne coveyteth have,
Is riche, al-though ye holde him but a knave. (D 1183-90.)

Skeat has a good note on this referring to *Epistle*, 2, 4, which is clearly the source:

'honesta' inquit (*i. e.*, Epicurus) 'res est laeta paupertas' illa, vero non est paupertas, si laeta est. non qui parum habet, sed qui plus cupit, pauper est.

We have already seen Chaucer borrowing from this epistle. The margin of the Ellesmere MS. refers us to "Seneca, in epistola." In the light of all that has gone before, we may now feel under less necessity of taking into account possible second-hand sources, such as John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, VII, 13, noted by Skeat, or the *De Paupertate*, at the head of which this passage stands in full.¹⁸

The traversing of so much ground, familiar in part, has justified itself if it has provided us with a somewhat clearer impression of the nature of Chaucer's indebtedness to Seneca in the *Canterbury Tales* than was readily to be had from the notes scattered through the standard books. So far as Chaucer shows any clear acquaintance at first hand with Seneca's thought, he seems to be limited to the *Epistles*. There, however, we are justified in giving entertainment to the hypothesis that he had read somewhat widely and reflected to some purpose. It remains to find confirmation of this hypothesis in a place where, so far as I know, the influence of Seneca has not been suspected, I mean in the *Troilus*.

There we must not expect to find Seneca referred to by name. In the *Troilus* Chaucer is sedulous to avoid anachronisms. Perhaps with a view to gaining easier acceptance for the conventions in which the whole story lives and moves, he has sought escape

¹⁸ *Supplementum*, ed., Haase, p. 56.

from the present in a remote past, where anything might happen; and, save for an occasional touch of Christian phraseology, which would doubtless slip by the contemporary reader even more easily than it did the author, he achieves a remarkably consistent atmosphere. So consistent, indeed, that one might be pardoned for sometimes wondering if he does not in part defeat his own ends. His background becomes so convincing in its consistency, that in his desire, if he had it, to remove the story out of our familiar moral environment he ends by putting it in an environment which the potency of his art makes just as familiar to us as our own. Oenone's letter (I, 653 ff.) came by last night's post and Helen of Troy is a lady we recently took out to dinner. Thus a story which was conceived in the first instance as taking place in some moral Arcadia at times shows signs of strain, once Chaucer has provided it with an intensely realistic background and furnished with characters complex and very much alive. *Gemuit sub pondere cymba sutilis.*

Whether this be true or not, it is a fact that Chaucer does not let his characters quote the *auctores*, as is freely done in the *Canterbury Tales*.¹⁹ Oenone's epistle is not called Ovid's. Pandarus, quoting Ovid, by way of Boccaccio, refers for authority to a vague Zanzis, who might have lived before the great flood. There is no anachronism in the ladies reading the story of Thebes—no one says that it is Statius's version, and Diomed recognizes the whole matter as very much a family affair of his own (V, 134). Quotations from Boethius (I, 730) and, indirectly, from Lucan are introduced without any citation of authority; a quotation from Solomon (I, 694) is referred simply to "the wyse." That Pandarus should tell a tale of Wade (III, 614) is not a demonstrable anachronism; if it is incongruous, it is the incongruity that was of the very essence of the Middle Ages, and of that sort we should have had a great deal more if Chaucer had not been aiming so consistently at local color. Chaucer himself, to be sure, as the manager of the show, allows himself on his own account a little more freedom. He, Chaucer, apostrophizes Juvenal (IV, 197) and mentions Crassus

¹⁹ In this connection, the reader will surely not deny himself the pleasure of re-perusing Professor Kittredge's wise and witty words on *Chaucer's Lollins*, in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXVIII (1917), pp. 47-133.

(III, 1391), but these things are quite outside the picture. And the purposes to which he turns his Seneca are very much of the picture; it is with the help of Seneca that Pandarus is transformed out of the youth Pandaro; indeed, the philosophic mind which added years have brought to Pandarus owes not a little to the Senecan passages with which Chaucer eked out Boccaccio's suggestions. We are but a moment in Pandarus's company before we perceive the debt. He is introduced to us in the act of urging Troilus to conceal nothing from his friend, whose right it is to share pain as well as joy (I, 592), and such a friend, too, qualified by his very misfortunes. So much was suggested by Boccaccio,²⁰ but he clinches the argument with pure Seneca:

And witeth wel, that bothe two ben vyces,
Mistrusten alle, or elles alle leve. (I, 687.)

This is the precise phraseology of *Epistle* 3, 4:

utrumque enim vitium est, et omnibus credere et nulli.²¹

Chaucer was doubtless reminded of this *Epistle* by the striking similarity between Pandaro's argument in Boccaccio, which he substantially reproduces, and Seneca's: tu vero omnia cum amico delibera . . . tam audaciter cum illo loquere quam tecum . . . sed quia interveniunt quaedam, quae consuetudo fecit arcana, cum amico omnes curas, omnes cogitationes tuas misce (*Ep.* 3, 2-3). This would lead him naturally to the philosophic tag quoted above. And it is just this tendency to philosophic generalization which at this point marks the difference between Pandaro and Pandarus.

Pandarus now proceeds to point out the folly of luxuriating in one's grief, seeking no other remedy:

Delyte not in wo thy wo to seche,
As doon thise foles that hir sorwes eche
With sorwe, whan they han misaventure,
And listen nought to seche hem other cure. (I, 704.)

I must confess I never got the full force of *delyte* until I read it in the light of the following passage:

²⁰ *Il Filostrato*, II, 4-5, 10.

²¹ The phrasing in *De Moribus* (77) is quite different: "vitium est omnia credere, vitium nihil credere." (*Supplementum*, ed. Fr. Haase, Teubner text, p. 63.)

quid enim est turpius quam captare in ipso luctu voluptatem, immo per luctum, et inter lacrimas quoque iuvet, quaerere? (*Ep.* 99, 26.)

No, continues Pandarus, I cannot bear to have you entertain so foolish a notion "that of thy wo is no curacioun" (*I.* 791); you have at least the satisfaction of knowing that if fortune's joys must pass, so also must her sorrows (*I.* 845).

When Pandarus has finally learned the precise nature of Troilus' troubles, he begins the task of rousing him with a striking passage from Seneca:

For certainly, the firste poynt is this
Of noble corage and wel ordeynè,
A man to have pees with him-self, y-wis. (*I.* 891.)

Primum argumentum compositae mentis existimo posse consistere et secum morari. (*Ep.* 2, 1.)

The phrasing is here too close to admit of doubt, but it is so wrought into the fabric of the courtly love convention that it is perhaps not surprising that it, like the close of Pandarus's exposition of friendship quoted above, should have gone so long undetected. But there is evidence to confirm the belief that Chaucer assimilated more of this epistle, the second. It may turn out, Pandarus continues, that your joy will grow out of your present distress;²² persevere:

But he that parted is in every place
Is no-wher hool, as writen clerkes wyse. (*I.* 960.)

Is not this Seneca in the very next paragraph?

Nusquam est, qui ubique est. (*Ep.* 2, 2.)

It is the more likely to be so, since both writers, although the subject under discussion is different, illustrate the point in precisely the same way:

As plaunte a tre or herbe, in sondry wyse,
And on the morwe pulle it up as blyve,
No wonder is, though it may never thryve. (*I.* 964.)

²² Cf. Quotiens enim felicitatis et causa et initium fuit, quod calamitas vocabatur. (*110.* 3.)

non conualescit planta, quae saepe transfertur.²³ (*Ep.* 2, 3.)

We have now followed Pandarus's argument through to the end of the first book; the Senecan origin of some of his more important philosophic deliverances seems plain. What strikes us is not so much the grasp and penetration with which Chaucer understands and reflects upon his author, though I think a case is gradually making out for much more extensive reading in Seneca than he has been credited with; but rather his ingenuity in harmonizing the thought of the pagan philosopher with the mediaeval background. So successfully, indeed, has he done it that Seneca's contribution, instead of remaining, as in less skilful hands it might have done, an obvious accidental decoration, is incorporated into the substance of the work; and so completely as to escape the detection of scholars, yet so essentially as to be one of the important sources of the pagan atmosphere of the poem and one of the important ingredients in the construction of the character of Pandarus. To draw into combination, or at least into contiguity, material from the most diverse sources is habitual with the mediaeval writer. But to do this, and successfully, with the conscious purpose of creating an appropriate atmosphere for a story of long ago, is Chaucer's rare artistic triumph. Because of his artistry, Chaucer, more keenly than most men of the Middle Ages, who tended to see all times and climes in their own image, was aware that we change with the times:

Ye knowe eek, that in forme of speche is chaunge
With-inne a thousand yeer, and wordes tho
That hadden prys, now wonder nyce and straunge
Us thinketh hem; and yet they spake hem so,
And spedde as wel in love as men now do;
Eek for to winne love in sondry ages,
In sondry londes, sondry ben usages. . . .
For-thy men seyn, ech contree hath his lawes. (II, 22.)

It is quite possible that he owed some part of his clearer vision of these things to Seneca, too:

²³ This last sentence, to be sure, Koepfel (*Archiv. f. d. Studium d. neueren Sprachen*, 86, 44) finds in Albertano of Brescia's *Liber de Amore Dei* (fol. 45b), with which Chaucer betrays acquaintance, but Chaucer seems familiar with the whole context, and this familiarity he could have got only, so far as I know, by reading the epistle itself.

adice nunc, quod oratio certam regulam non habet:
consuetudo illam civitatis, quae numquam in eodem
diu stetit, versat.²⁴ (*Ep.* 114, 13.)

si in Parthia natus esset, arcum infans
statim tenderet; si in Germania, protinus puer
tenerum hastile vibraret; si avorum nostrorum
temporibus fuisset, equitare et hostem comminus
percutere didicisset. *haec singulis disciplina
gentis suae suadet atque imperat.*²⁵ (*Ep.* 36, 7.)

Chaucer obviously is not copying these passages; he is not repeating commonplaces; he is giving artistic expression to a point of view, not the ordinary point of view of the Middle Ages, to which he has thought out his way. And since we have found him dependent for so much on Seneca, we may at least give entertainment to the possibility that the Philosopher helped him here as well.

It does not appear that after the first book Pandarus makes much, if any, use of Seneca; the burden of his consolations, indeed, his advice to seek a new friend, his recommendation of activity, and especially his efforts to put bounds to the grief both of Troilus and of Cressida by rousing their self-respect, is all in line with Senecan precept, but Boethius and Ovid had spoken helpfully on these points, and Pandarus's language nowhere approaches Seneca close enough to make it worth while to quote details. Only in Troilus's reply to Pandarus's proffers of help is the Senecan note clear enough to warrant quotation:

Thow farest eek by me, thou Pandarus,
As he, that whan a wight is wo bi-gooun,
He cometh to him a pas, and seyth right thus,
"Thenk not on smert, and thou shalt fele noon." (*IV*, 463.)

This is precisely what Seneca urges:

²⁴ Cf. *Ep.* 58, 5, and, of course, Horace, *Ad Pisones*, 71. My friend Professor Weeks calls my attention to the striking passage at the opening of Wace's *Roman de Rou*, vol. I, p. 5:

Par lung tems e par lung aage,
Et par muement de language,
Ont perdu lor primerains nons
Viles, citez e regions.

²⁵ Cf. Boethius, *II*, prose 7, 49.

levis est dolor, si nihil illi opinio adiecerit:
 contra, si exhortari te coeperis ac dicere:
 'nihil est aut certe exiguum est. duremus:
 iam desinet': levem illum, dum putas, facies.
 omnia ex opinione suspensa sunt. (*Ep.* 78, 13.)

Undoubtedly a commonplace (cf. Boethius, II, prose 4, 79 ff.), but the fact that both passages are thrown into direct discourse may, in the light of all that has gone before, be allowed some consideration.

Here, at any rate, are the facts as I have been able to assemble them. I hope it will not be urged against me that I have weakened a good case by citing some parallels which in themselves are of so general a nature as to be of no probative value. But the fact of Chaucer's indebtedness to Seneca needs no further proof; it is merely a question of estimating the extent and the character of the English poet's reactions to the philosopher. And here I hope it will be someone's good fortune to find points which in comparing two rather long works I may have overlooked. Nor do I feel obliged at the moment to offer a theory as to how and in what form the *Epistles* reached Chaucer. That he read in them fairly extensively and made characteristic use of his reading, and that in one or two places we can understand his thought a little better by referring to its source, is all I ask to have recognized.

HARRY MORGAN AYRES

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

EL LAUSO DE *GALATEA* DE CERVANTES ES ERCILLA¹

UNA de las tendencias que hoy nos parecen más extrañas y curiosas en los escritores contemporáneos de Ercilla y que perduró aún hasta muy avanzado el siglo XVII, fué el género de la novela pastoril, en que, bajo nombres supuestos, y vestidos con el traje de pastores, se quiso representar a algunos personajes, de ordinario amigos del autor: tendencia que alcanzó tan vastas proyecciones, que hubo de repercutir hasta en América, donde el poeta chileno Pedro de Oña, por ejemplo, ideó componer una novela de esa índole, que había de tener por asunto las aventuras galantes de don García Hurtado de Mendoza, pues en su *Arauco domado*, dirigiéndose a él, le decía:

Cuando mejor le sepa dar el corte,
Y si la Parca no me corta el hilo,
Yo cortaré, señor, con otro filo,
Tus venturosos lances en la corte
En traje pastoril, mi propio estilo,
Que en esto, ni será el de cortesano,
Ni bastará tampoco el corte sano.

Pero tan peregrina, aunque característica idea de aquellos tiempos de la literatura, no llegó a realizarla, que ella estaba reservada, aunque para desarrollarla en corta escala, a otro no menos entusiasta apologista del antiguo gobernador de Chile, el doctor Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa,—“ingenio docto y agudo, si bien procaz y presuntuoso,” como tan acertadamente le calificó Menéndez y Pelayo,¹—en una de las últimas muestras, bastante mediocre, aunque bien escrita, que alcanzó ese género literario, *La constante Amarilis*, en la cual se le hace figurar con ocasión de su próximo matrimonio: y luego en los versos en que resume todo su gobierno en Chile y en el Perú, añade, con respecto al tiempo aquél, abandonando ya su rebuscada prosa para trocarla en acentos poéticos, alternativa obligada en tales novelas:

¹ *Horacio en España*, t. II, p. 104.

Viendo que de sus fueros
huyen los corazones araucanos;
y con intentos fieros
remiten al esfuerzo de sus manos
casi oprimir el orbe,
cual hondo mar que las corrientes sorbe:

Al sucesor valiente
de claros y sin par antecesores,
que con valor prudente
domar supieron bárbaros furores,
la sugestión concede,
porque el vencer como el estado herede,

aludiendo con estas últimas palabras a Carlos V y a Felipe II.³

Dicho esto de paso, por lo que interesa al que estuvo llamado a ser el héroe de *La Araucana*, notemos que Cervantes no escapó a esta corriente de su tiempo, habiendo iniciado, precisamente, su carrera literaria con la publicación de una obra de aquel género, que llamó *Galatea* y vió la luz pública a fines de 1584. En el prólogo indicó que muchos de los pastores que en ella aparecían correspondían a personajes de verdad,³ y, en efecto, no cabe hoy duda para los críticos de que bajo el nombre de Meliso se ocultaba don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza; el "divino" Francisco de Figueroa, bajo el de Tirsi; Pedro Laynez con el de Damón; Luis Gálvez de Montalvo con el de Siralvo, cual él se había llamado en su *Pastor de Filida*; y según quería uno de los más notables cervantistas, disfrazado con el de Elision andaría el propio autor, que contaba sus amores con la heroína de la novela, pastora nacida en las orillas del Tajo, que no sería otra que la dama que muy luego después había de ser su esposa;⁴ si bien en nuestros días no ha faltado quien con buenas

³ *La constante Amarilis*, pp. 125-127.

³ "... mas advirtiéndolo (como en el discurso de la obra alguna vez se hace) que muchos de los disfrazados pastores della lo eran sólo en el hábito. . . ."

⁴ Fernández de Navarrete, *Vida de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra*, Madrid, 1819, p. 66: "No puede caber duda, son sus palabras, de que esta fué la verdadera Galatea, así como tampoco puede haberla de que bajo los nombres de Tirsi, Damón, Meliso, Siralvo, Lauso, Larsileo y Artidoro introdujo en aquella fábula a Francisco de Figueroa, Pedro Laines, D. Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, Luis Gálvez de Montalvo, Luis Barahona de Soto, D. Alonso de Ercilla y micer Andrés Rey de Artieda, todos amigos suyos y muy celebrados poetas de aquel siglo."

razones sostenga que Elisio y Galatea no se refieren ni pueden referirse a Cervantes ni a doña Catalina de Palacios Salazar y Voz-mediano.⁵

Mas en la ficción arcádica de Cervantes hay dos de sus pastores que nos interesan especialmente, cuades son, Lauso, que ocultaría a Luis Barahona de Soto, y Larsileo a don Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga. Ya lo dijo Fernández de Navarrete y abundan en esta misma creencia (concretándose sólo a Ercilla) Hartzembusch,⁶ y Rodríguez Marín,⁷ si bien este último, examinando la figuración atribuida en la novela a Lauso, opina que no está del todo probado que ocultara a Barahona de Soto. Testimonios de tal valía parece que deben alejar toda sospecha respecto a la identificación de Ercilla y Larsileo, siendo sólo de sentir que ninguno de esos eruditos nos indique siquiera el más mínimo fundamento de su aserto.⁸ Si no estamos equivocados, ese fundamento debemos buscarlo, desde luego, en el nombre mismo de Larsileo, que envuelve, al parecer, un anagrama casi completo del de Ercilla, pues con excepción de la *o* y del cambio de la *c* por *s*, ambos se corresponden perfectamente, tal como algo de muy semejante ocurre, indudablemente, entre Artidoro y Artieda; y, en seguida, en la figuración atribuida a Larsileo en la novela. En verdad, ella es tan breve, que apenas si una lectura atenta llega a descubrirla, como que se reduce en efecto a que Lauso compuso una canción, que envió al "famoso Larsileo, que en los negocios de la corte tiene larga y ejercitada experiencia," y que esa canción "fué tan celebrada de Larsileo cuanto bien admitida de los que en aquel tiempo la vieron."⁹

⁵ Rodríguez Marín, *Luis Barahona de Soto*, p. 118, nota 1.

⁶ "... otros poetas intentaron disfrazar la sociedad con el traje de pastores. Cervantes quiso, además, retratar de intento a determinados personajes. Bajo los nombres de ... Larsileo quiso celebrar a don Alonso de Ercilla. ... " Prólogo al tomo I de la *Colección de Autores Españoles* de Rivadeneyra.

⁷ *El Loaysa del Celoso extremeño*, p. 317. "Persuadido estoy también ... de que Larsileo y Artidoro son Ercilla y Rey de Artieda. ..." *Barahona de Soto*, p. 119, nota 1.

⁸ En la nota 145 de su citado libro, Fernández de Navarrete ofreció que en el análisis que se proponía hacer de *Galatea* tendría ocasión "de correr el velo a los hechos y personajes verdaderos que se ocultan ingeniosamente entre las aventuras y pastores de aquella novela," lo que al fin no verificó.

⁹ Página 137 de la edición de Baudry, París, 1841, que es la de que dispongo y continuaré citando.

Tal es la única vez en que aparece Larsileo mencionado en la novela. ¿Bastan el calificativo de “famoso” que se le da y el de haber sido muy versado en los negocios de la Corte para que podamos llegar a identificarle con Ercilla? Ciertamente que no. Circunstancias son éstas que tanto pueden convenir a Ercilla como a otros y no implican de por sí algo peculiarísimo a nuestro poeta, como las hay en la novela si se estudia la figura de Lauso, cuyas características, si así podemos llamarlas, se avienen muy de cerca con las del autor de *La Araucana*, y tal es lo que vamos a intentar poner de manifiesto.

Antes, sin embargo, recordemos como antecedente que no carece de importancia para explicarnos el que a Ercilla se le representase en la novela, que en ella, en el *Canto de Calíope*, el príncipe de los ingenios españoles, después de mencionar a don Alonso de Leiva, prosigue así:

Otro del mismo nombre, que de Arauco
Cantó las guerras, y el valor de España,
El cual les reinos donde habita Glauco
Pasó, y sintió la embravecida saña;
No fué su voz, no fué su acento rauco,
Que uno y otro fué de gracia extraña,
Y tal, que Ercilla en este hermoso asiento
Merece eterno y sacro monumento;

dando con ello testimonio del modo en que entonces reconocía sus méritos, cuando el poeta no había dado aún remate a su obra y ya su genio se veía consagrado a la posteridad por el mismo que años más tarde lo había de repetir por boca del Cura en el escrutinio de la librería de don Quijote, colocándo *La Araucana* en el lugar a que tenía derecho entre las epopeyas castellanas; haciéndonos saber, a la vez, que conocía la vida aventurera de su autor y de manera indirecta la amistad que con él le ligaba desde los días de la campaña de Portugal y continuada sin duda después entre ambos en Madrid.

Mediaba ya en esto un precedente para que Ercilla pudiera ser incluido por el autor de *Galatea* entre los pastores llamados a figurar en ella.

Queda ya dicho que Rodríguez Marín se inclinaba a desechar la opinión de los que en Lauso creían ver a Barahona de Soto, fundado en que “no le convienen de modo alguno,—son sus palabras,

—aquellas frases del libro IV: “. . . y así imaginaron que como Lauso había andado por muchas partes de España, y aun de toda Asia y Europa . . .”; ni aquellas otras: “. . . un pastor amigo mío, que Lauso se llama, el cual, después de haber gastado algunos años en cortesanos ejercicios y algunos otros en los trabajosos del duro Marte. . . .”¹⁰

Y con esto tenemos ya avanzado no poco, pues con tan autorizada opinión queda desechada de hecho la hipótesis hasta ahora tan válida de que Lauso fuera Barahona de Soto.

Examinemos ahora, según ofrecí, punto por punto, la figuración de Lauso en la novela y veamos si lo que de ella resulta es aplicable en sus varios incidentes a rasgos biográficos correspondientes a *Ercilla*, comenzando por hacer notar que, si va por anagramas, no hay entre Lauso y Alonso más diferencias que las que median entre *Ercilla* y *Larsileo*.

Sentado esto, diré que hay algo más que agregar a lo expresado por el eximio cervantista a que acabo de aludir. Esas peregrinaciones por muchas partes de España y de gran parte de Europa atribuidas en la novela a Lauso, son características de la vida aventurera de *Ercilla*, que él mismo recordaría más tarde en su poema, al evocar, ya al despedirse de las letras, la carrera que había llevado:

¡Cuántas tierras corré, cuántas naciones
Hacia el helado norte atravesando. . . . ¡

Cierto es que la alusión a los viajes por el Asia no cuadran a nuestro poeta; pero ¿acaso no recordaba él aquel continente cuando el mágico *Fitón* le muestra en su milagrosa redoma y comienza por decirle:

“Mira al principio de Asia a Calcedonia,

y luego le va señalando, siempre en virtud de esa ficción, pero en el hecho consignando los dictados de *Ercilla*:

“Dentro y fuera del Gange mira tanta
Tierra de India al levante prolongada. . . . ?”¹¹

¹⁰ *Luis Barahona de Soto*, *lug. cit.*

¹¹ Esta alusión al Asia y, en general, a las peregrinaciones de Lauso (en la hipótesis de que bajo tal nombre aparezca designado *Ercilla*) nos trae a la memoria aquella otra que *Belmonte Bermúdez* le dedica, nombrándole con todas

Pero aun más de cerca puede convenirle aquella referencia de “haber gastado algunos años en cortesanos ejercicios y algunos otros en los trabajosos del duro Marte”; pues ¿quién ignora que desde su niñez Ercilla vivió en la Corte, a la que ingresó de nuevo después de su regreso de América, y que en ella trató a la que había de ser su mujer, y en la que tanto lugar se hizo, que encumbrados personajes le apadrinaron en su casamiento? ¿Y para qué hablar de los años que gastó en la guerra, cuando gran parte de su poema no es otra cosa que la historia de sus campañas en Arauco? Así, ambas alusiones, fuerza es reconocerlo, convienen de todo en todo con los hechos de Ercilla.

Inoficioso sería contar de las restantes aquellas sin saliendo de ellas, cierto misterio envuelve ya la frase en que Cervantes dice que Lauso fué recibido por los demás pastores con corteses palabras, especialmente de Damón, “de quien era antiguo y verdadero amigo”; y pues en Damón, según los críticos a una lo afirman, se halla representado Pedro Laynez, convendría averiguar si medió realmente tal amistad entre éste y Ercilla. No podría probarlo, si bien buen indicio de tal amistad se encuentra en el hecho de que veamos a ambos contribuir con sendos sonetos en elogio de otro amigo común, Pedro de Padilla, cuando quiso dar a luz su *Tesoro de varias poesías*, libro que había sido impreso cuatro años antes que *Galatea*.

Reunidos todos los pastores, Lauso canta una glosa, y sabemos que Ercilla fué autor de una que se hizo famosa; y luego después, Damón recita una canción de ese su amigo, en la cual se encuentra aquella frase relativa a la ingratitud con que suele corresponder el señor a quien le sirve, y que “por un descuido, una nonada,” fulmine

De breve despedida la sentencia,

en la cual hemos creído ver el motivo del disavor en que cayó el sus letras, en *La Hispállica* (citada por don Justo Zaragoza, mi amigo que fué, en su prólogo a los *Viajes de Pedro Fernández de Quirós*, t. I, p. lxvi):

El pecho puse a la mayor jornada,
Llegando al sol los pensamientos míos,
Y tocando en la tierra, en van armada,
Nombre dimos al mar, nombre a los ríos;
Como de Arauco en la jamás domada
Región, notaba los soberbios bríos
Arcila, de los bárbaros chilenos,
Si bien yo anduve más y escribí menos.

poeta cerca de Felipe II, según lo dije en la biografía suya; y a la que pudiera agregarse al otra, que también se consigna en ella, de que a ese servidor,

Ni el desdén sacudido
Del sutil secretario le fatiga,

que parece convenir punto por punto a la situación que ese creó al poeta en la misión que se le confió para recibir a los Duques de Brunswick, manejada por el secretario Zayas, de que en su lugar hablé también: sospechas que parecen hallar confirmación de que proceden de hechos real y verdaderamente ocurridos, cuando al aplaudirla los pastores que la escuchaban, respondió Damón a uno de ellos: "con razón lo puedes decir, pues la *verdad* y artificio suyo es digno de justas alabanzas."

Aplicable también a Ercilla, mejor dicho, a su mujer doña María de Bazán, son los tercetos que canta Lauso al hacer la pintura de la pastora objeto de sus amores, especialmente aquellos que dicen:

No en cuantas tuvo hermosas la pasada
Edad, ni la presente tiene agora,
Ni en la de por venir será hallada,
Quien llegase ni llegue a mi pastora
En valor, en saber, en hermosura,
En merecer del mundo ser señora,

que semejan reflejo fiel de los conceptos con que el poeta describe a doña María en su *Araucana*:

Era de tierna edad, pero mostraba
En su sosiego discreción madura . . .
(Rendido y entregado a su hermosura) . . .

Retrato a que falta sólo el saber de doña María, omisión que se suple con lo que acerca de él escribía Garibay, diciéndonos que "era muy amiga de la lección de la Historia sobre cuantas señoras había tratado en estos reinos."

Más aún: hasta podríamos encontrar en otras frases de la novela los vestigios de aquellos amores de Ercilla. Departiendo Lauso con Damón, y "preguntándole éste ahincadamente que le dijese quién era la pastora que con tanta facilidad de la libre voluntad le había rendido; y cuando esto no pudo saber de Lauso, le rogó con

grandes veras, que a lo menos le dijese en qué estado se hallaba, si era de temor o de esperanza, si le fatigaba ingratitud, o si le atormentaban celos. A todo lo cual satisfizo bien Lauso, contándole algunas cosas que con su pastora le habían sucedido; y entre otras le dijo, “cómo hallándose un día celoso y desfavorecido, había llegado á términos de desesperarse, o de dar alguna muestra que en daño de su persona y en el del crédito y honra de su pastora redundase, pero que se remedió con haberla hablado y haberle ella asegurado ser falsa la sospecha que tenía: confirmado todo esto con darle un anillo de su mano, que fué parte para volver a mejor discurso su entendimiento. . . .”

¿No parece que estamos oyendo aquí repercutir las palabras de la monja confidente de doña María y las de la escritura en que doña Marquesa de Ugarte declaraba que el matrimonio de su hija debía verificarse antes de lo que se había señalado, “por justos respetos”? Escena trasuntada aún más de cerca en los versos de Lauso a su Silena, que siguen inmediatamente a las confidencias a Damón, en los que, hablando de su locura de amor, dice:

El me fuerza, y ella mueve
‘A que te adore y escriba,
Y como en los dos estriba
Mi fe, la mano se atreve;
Y aunque en esta grave culpa
Me amenaza tu rigor,
Mi fe, tu hermosura, amor,
Darán del yerro disculpa;

para alabar luego “la singular hermosura, discreción, donaire, honestidad y valor de su pastora.”

Y, todavía, en otros versos de Lauso parece aludir a las redes del amor libre en que se veía envuelto antes de su matrimonio, que hoy nos son bien conocidas, cuando, al celebrar los ojos de su amada, exclama:

En ciega escuridad andaba cuando
Vuestra luz me faltaba, ¡oh bellos ojos!
‘Acá y allá, sin ver el cielo, errando
Entre agudas espinas y entre abrojos;
Mas luego, en el momento que tocando
Fueron al alma mía los manojos

De vuestros rayos claros, vi a la clara
La senda de mi bien abierta y clara ;

y hasta del porvenir que se le esperaba al lado de la que había de ser su esposa :

Vi que sois y seréis, ojos serenos,
Quien me levanta y puede levantarme
A que entre corto número de buenos
Venga como mejor a señalarme . . .

Esa referencia a sus pasados amores se trasparenta con mayor claridad al cantar de nuevo :

Por ti la luz de mis cansados ojos,
Tanto tiempo turbada y aun perdida,
Al sér primero ha vuelto que tenía ;
Por ti torno a gozar de los despojos
Que de mi voluntad y de mi vida
Llevó de amor la antigua tiranía ;
Por ti, la noche de mi error, en día
De sereno discurso
Se ha vuelto, y la razón, que antes estaba
En posesión de esclava,
Con sosegado y advertido curso,
Siendo agora señora, me conduce
Do el bien eterno mas se muestra y luce.

¿No es ésta, en verdad, la invocación del poeta a la Razón, que consignó en su *Araucana* cuando sus ojos,

Libres del torpe y del grosero vicio,
Que la vista hasta allí me iba ocupando,

se le aparece para decirle :

Mas tente, que me importa a mí, primero
Que de los ojos fáciles te fíes,
Prevenir al peligro venidero
Para que dél con tiempo te desvíes?

Reminiscencia del poema que no es la única en la novela, si recordamos que en el diálogo en tercetos en que Cervantes hace más adelante intervenir a Lauso, se hallan versos que parecen tomados de aquél; por ejemplo :

Del bien perdido al cabo qué nos queda?
Cuándo suele cobrarse el bien perdido?

en la novela, y a este tenor varios otros que sería fatigoso traer a cuenta.¹²

Baste con este cotejo y trasunto que he hecho en el supuesto que en *Galatea* figuren algunos de los amigos de Cervantes con los disfrazados nombres de pastores. Así sea, si esto satisface a la crítica sentimental. Pero don Quijote no lo debió creer así, cuando un día dijo: “¿Piensas tú que las Amarilis, las Filis, las Silvias, las Dianas, las Galateas, las Filidas y otras tales de que los libros . . . están llenos, fueron verdaderamente de carne y hueso, y de aquellos que las celebran y las celebraron? No por cierto, sino que las más se las fingen por dar sujeto a sus versos. Esta reivindicación de la fantasía pura vale también para los que quieren ver disfrazados de pastores en la *Galatea* a muchos de los poetas contemporáneos.”¹³

J. T. MEDINA.

¹² Las referencias a *La Araucana* aquí indicadas pueden parecer, quizás, por su misma generalidad, un tanto vagas; pero que Cervantes estuvo bien empapado en la lectura del poema ercillano es cosa fuera de duda, tanto, que es lícito asegurar que se sabía de memoria algunos de sus versos, de que son buen testimonio aquellos dos insertos en el capítulo XIV de la Segunda Parte de *El Ingenioso Hidalgo*:

Y tanto el vencedor es más honrado,
Cuanto más el vencido es reputado,

que corrieron prosificados en todas las ediciones, hasta que Rodríguez Marín en la suya los restableció en su forma original, salvando las ligeras variantes que se le habían escapado a Cervantes al citarlos.

¹³ Paolo Savj López, *Cervantes*, p. 54, traducción de Antonio G. Solalinde, Madrid, 1917, 8°.

EREC'S TREATMENT OF ENIDE

"La vérité est dans une nuance."—Renan.

IN the *Romanic Review*, IX, 1 ff., Professor Ogle attacks my interpretation of Crestien's *Erec*, but on inadequate grounds. He thinks that Erec's motive in treating Enide harshly is not his wounded sense of sovereignty but "the doubt which he feels of her love for him." Since Professor Ogle has missed the point of much of my discussion, in fact at times misconstrues my remarks hopelessly, it will be well to recall the purpose of my former study—in answering him here.

My previous article (*MP*, XI, 445-489) aimed to justify the view that Crestien "wove his episodes into a definite plot by stressing the moral relationship of his two pairs of lovers." In expressing this view (p. 459) I was in essential agreement with the ideas of Roques (*Rom.*, XXXIX, 379) as summed up in the words:

l'amour le plus profond, le plus fécond en joies, n'est pas l'amour exclusif qui se subordonne toute la vie, mais celui qui tient compte de la vie et se tient satisfait d'en avoir embelli tous les instants

—with the stricture that I do not agree with Roques that "*il faut*¹ qu'Érec ait douté de l'amour d'Énide" in order to explain his harsh treatment of her, and that when it comes to the contrast between the two main episodes "I differ from Roques *only* in emphasizing, as it appears Crestien intends us to do, the rôles of Erec and Mabonagrain as well as those of Enide and her nameless cousin (p. 460)."

My reason for making these distinctions lay in the fact, which I think my discussion made clear, that Crestien is contrasting one ideal of the love-relation: that in which the lover submits completely to his love, imposed by an imperious *amie* [Mabonagrain], with the other, more human ideal, in which the lover learns that he does not need thus to submit [Erec]. So that, while Erec proclaims himself at the end of the episode to be the lover of old:

¹ The italics are mine.

"Tot a vostre comandement
Vuel estre des or an avant,
Aussi con j'estoie devant" (vs. 4926),

it is yet with this difference: he is no longer a victim to "sloth," induced (unwillingly to be sure) by his lady, but his own master, perceiving, as Professor Woodbridge (*RR*, VI, 442) has well said, "that uncontrolled passion may lead astray; it must be guided and kept to its own highest ideal; it must inspire and not efface his knighthood." In short, against Mabonagrain, the slave of a selfish and exacting mistress, Crestien sets Erec, the exemplar of a self-respecting marriage, of whom Enide has a right to say (vs. 4689) that she is his *fame* as well as his *amie*.

With the object of setting the two episodes in the clearest light possible, and above all—for that was the real object of my study—to show that Erec's behaviour is not motivated by jealousy, I used Chaucer's expression of *soveraynētee*, in the sense in which it is used in the following verses from the *Franklin's Tale*, placed at the head of my article:

Of his free wyl he swoor hire as a knyght,
That never in al his lyf he, day ne nyght,
Ne sholde upon hym takē no maistrie
Agayn hir wyl, ne kithe her jalousie;
But hire obeye and folwe hir wyl in al,
As any love to his lady shal,
Save that *the name of soveraynētee*,
That wolde he have, for shame of his degree.

In my effort to guard against misinterpretation (in this case apparently futile) I said at the outset: "If these lines are repeated here at the beginning . . . it is because they furnish a 'convenient' expression of what I think is the fundamental issue of Crestien de Troyes' poem." And again, in summarizing, I said: "Is not the motive, therefore, purely one of *soveraynētee* (note the italics), to borrow Chaucer's expression? Enide has been the innocent cause of her husband's fall from grace. It is only natural that Erec, wounded in his pride, should turn against the cause of his dishonor, blameless as Enide really is." For me, as well as for the poet (D'Erec, le fil Lac, est li contes, vs. 19), the theme of the

story thruout is Erec,² and it is in elaborating a point made by Foerster that I differ from the view expressed by Roques or that I ever expressed myself as differing from it.

When, therefore, Professor Ogle (*l. c.*), after commending the views of Roques (*l. c.*), Sheldon (*RR.*, V, 115 ff.) and Woodbridge (*RR.*, VI, 434 ff.), remarks: "there would be no further need . . . of argument about the matter [namely, Erec's motive], were it not for the fact that an entirely different theory advanced by Nitze . . . still stands as a challenge to those who hold other views"; and then adds (p. 6): "How a husband can be at the same time sovereign over his wife and under her control, I fail to see, and from this point of view the poem is a *reductio ad absurdum*"—my answer is:

1. That Gaston Paris³ (*Rom.*, XX, 164) and Zenker (*Zur Mabinogionfrage*, 74) think that Erec was "jealous";

2. that my view is essentially that of Foerster (see Sheldon, 121), tho on a different basis;

3. that Woodbridge's view⁴ is that Erec primarily believed that Enide doubted his valor;

4. that as regards the "moral" of the tale my view is in perfect accord with the lines cited above from Roques; and

5. that a careful reading of Chaucer's lines explains precisely in what sense "a husband can be at the same time sovereign over his wife and under her control."

It is certainly true, as Professor Sheldon wisely remarks, that "any attempt to find out what was in the poet's mind must be more or less conjectural, and only a certain degree of probability can be obtained." The very diversity of views expressed bears testimony to this fact, and I should be the very first to subscribe to Sheldon's statement of it. But in asserting that my own theory "stands as a challenge to those who hold other views," Professor Ogle not only gives me more credit than I deserve but he also overlooks the fact that much that others have said is quite recon-

² Compare Roques, 380: "ce drame 'psychologique' dont l'âme d'Erec est le théâtre."

³ "Toutefois, cette idée de *jalousie* me paraît ajoutée au récit par les conteurs français."

⁴ See his discussion; cf. G. Paris, 165.

cilable with my explanation of Erec's motive—an explanation inspired primarily by the aim of disproving "the [to me] false notion of the hero's jealousy as set forth in the parallel, and perhaps independent, version of the Welsh *Geraint*"—to quote the close of my article.

Since it is the value of ideas to force us to defend them, I shall at the expense of the reader's patience now restate what seems to me the point at issue and how I conceive of it.

In the first place, it appears self-evident that Erec's mad expedition⁵ at once tests Enide's love [see p. 448, where I said "her loyalty"] and his own valor. He cannot, without losing his self-respect, fail to prove his valor, nor can he, without being false to his better nature, refuse to pardon Enide after her superb manifestation of devotion. Professor Woodbridge rightly calls attention to the lines:

"Mes bien sachiez veraiemant:
S'an moi n'avoit de hardemant
Fors tant con vostre amors me baille,
Ne doteroie je sanz faille
Cors a cors nul home vivant (vs. 5855)."

Erec would have to be adamantine to admit less.

But we are not concerned here with the *result* of Erec's action, but with its *cause*, and this brings us to our second point.

The real question is whether the test-idea is Erec's prime motive, whether it is the well-spring of his action, the impulse—in a word—upon which he "abruptly gives [Enide] the order to prepare at once to ride" (Sheldon). For, there can be no doubt that Erec is swayed by impulse. He is moved, as his words (see vss. 2537 and 2665) and acts show, so moved, in fact, that Enide wonders whether her *orguel* has not destroyed his love, his love that was so subservient:

"Deus! don ne m'amoit trop mes sire?
An foi, lasse, trop m'amoit il.
.
.
.
.
.
Li miaudre hon, qui onques fust nez,
S'estoit si vers moi atornez

⁵ Roques, p. 379: "Pourquoi Erec est-il gravement irrité contre Enide?"

Que d'autre rien ne li chaloit

Mes trop m'a orguiauz sozleeve:

An mon orguel avrai damage,

Quant je ai dit si grant outrage,

Et bien est droiz que je l'i aie (vs. 2594)".

And again:

"Lasse!" fet ele, "con mar vi

Mon orguel et ma sorcuidance!

Savoir pooie sanz dotance

Que tel chevalier ne mellor

Ne savoit l'an de mon seignor.

Bien le savoie, or le sai miauz;

Car je l'ai veü a mes iauz,

Que trois ne cinc armez ne dote.

Honie soit ma langue tote,

Qui l'orguel et l'outrage dist,

Don mes cors a tel honte gist (vs. 3108)."

If this is not evidence that Enide sees the cause of Erec's harshness (that is, his "motive") in her woman's presumption,⁶ then what is evidence? And why, I may ask, should her guess not be correct? I repeat: we are not concerned here with the fact that Erec demonstrates his valor and incidentally learns the measure of Enide's affection, but with the question WHY DOES CHRÉTIEN'S EREC TREAT ENIDE SO HARSHLY?—to use the title of Professor Sheldon's article.

Now, it is true that Erec acknowledges the justice of Enide's complaint:

⁶ See Lowes' article, "Chaucer and the Seven Deadly Sins", *PMLA*, XXX (1915), 243, on "presumption" and "pride"; also the passage he cites, p. 351, on "chiding," from the *Parson's Tale*, I, 630.

And how that chydunge be a vileyns thing bitwixe all manere folk, yet it is certes most unconvenable bitwixe a man and his wyf; for there is nevere reste. . . . But she chyde him in o place, she wol chyde him in another. And therefore, 'bette is a morsel of breed with joye than a hous ful of delycles, with chydunge,' seith Salomon. *Seint Paul seith: 'O ye wommen, be ye subgetes to youre housbondes as bihoveth in god; and ye men, loveth youre wyves.'* But note especially the following (I, 400): Presumpcioun is whan a man undertaketh an emprise that hym oghte nat do, or elles that he may nat do, and this is called *surquidie* [Globe ed.].

"Dame!" fet il, "droit an eüstes,
Et cil qui m'an blasment ont droit."

But these laconic words state no more than, as a man, he must state, since they express the obvious truth, and we cannot assume that Crestien is depicting a fool. But if Erec is acting on this truth, why does he humiliate and lower Enide with every act and word? See vss. 2851 ff., 2914 ff., 2997 ff., 3316 ff. Professor Sheldon, more cautious than Professor Ogle, recalls Foerster's remark (*Einleitung*, 1909, p. XVIII) that "Erec . . . ist auf das Tiefste verletzt, dass der Gegenstand seiner Liebe, dem er sich ganz hingegen, ihm in solcher Weise seinen Minnedienst lohnt"; and admits that "it is certainly conceivable that in a more primitive form of the story Enide was a fairy and as such naturally had the upper hand, and that a relic of this situation has here survived." Yet, he himself is "disposed to think that the idea of sovereignty in marriage was not at all in Chrétien's mind," tho this assertion is considerably weakened by the sentence immediately following: "If it was there present as *one factor* [the italics are mine] in determining Erec's actions it can have been only a comparatively unimportant factor." In answering the question, therefore, why Erec begins by humiliating Enide, he argues (if I understand him correctly, p. 122) that Crestien did not intend to represent Erec as unjust but as inspired by a reasonable doubt or doubts (since there are several, pp. 123 ff.), a doubt even as to his own valor (p. 125), and Sheldon concludes: "the imperious need of solving such doubts as these leads him to the 'kill or cure' remedy which he chooses for the situation in which he finds himself." That is, as I understand Professor Sheldon, Enide's words, imperfectly understood by Erec, arouse the latter's doubts as to her, as to himself, etc., and it is in order to remove them once for all that Erec humiliates Enide.

Far more natural and less "ingenious" (to employ the word which Professor Sheldon twice uses of me, pp. 121 and 122), *me judice*, is the explanation that Erec is hurt, hurt at Enide's siding with his detractors; his pride or his sense of *soveraynètee* is aroused; he asserts it in both directions: (1) as to Enide, by humbling her, (2) as to himself, by proving his valor, which I see

no reason to think he seriously doubted; and learning in the course of the ride that Enide *can* submit, he forgives and reinstates her in her former position, since it would be absurd for him to commit the same fault he had erroneously attributed to the object of his love:

Ja n'avront bone compaignie
Loiaus amours et seignorie⁷

—at least not for long.

One point in my former article seems to have been generally overlooked (p. 447). In verse 2293 f. Crestien tells us:

Erec ne vost plus sejourner;
Sa *fame* comande atorner;

and in vs. 2438 the poet comments on the fact that altho Enide is Erec's wife, yet

A sa fame aloit donoier.
De li fist *s'amie et sa drue*.⁸

The words *amie* and *drue* are, I believe, used advisedly: they are in antithesis to *fame*. To what extent can Erec's *fame* remain his *amie*, since Enide is both (see vs. 4689)? To the extent of allowing Erec to rule when it is necessary. This, I take it, is the meaning or *sensus* of Crestien's *conjointure* (vs. 14):

. . . Tantum series juncturaque pollet.

It is not necessary that the poet should state the reconciliation of love and marriage more fully; nor is it essential that Crestien should make Erec say why he treats Enide harshly. The fact that this is not done is evidence, I have said (p. 447), of Crestien's artistic instinct.

In any case, whichever view we take as to Erec's motive, let us not confuse the issue by calling Erec in Woodbridge's phraseology: "A Cornelian Hero."⁹ Were Erec really a Cornelian in character, he would reason out his action, in so many words, *before* taking action. That is precisely what Erec does not do: he acts sud-

⁷ *Ovide moralisé*, II, 4977.

⁸ These lines are cited by Ogle, p. 11, who does not however go into the question they raise.

⁹ The title of Woodbridge's article; compare *MP*, XV (1917), 132, for the qualities of a Cornelian hero.

denly without argumentation. In other words, Erec is true to human nature, whereas Corneille's heroes, fed on the Neo-Platonism of the Renaissance, are super-human; and when we speak of a "Cornelian hero" we have or ought to have this fact in mind. With much that Professor Woodbridge says I agree, barring this essential point.

Professor Ogle, however, not only affirms that the idea of *soveraynètee* is absent from the *Erec* but also that the tale itself is not originally a fairy-mistress story. The theme of "uxoriousness" which it contains is thus not ultimately of Celtic origin but taken from Classical sources. In meeting this contention, I cannot of course repeat all of the arguments made in my first study. But I shall point out the obvious errors of statement and interpretation which Ogle makes with regard to them.

First, the question of "uxoriousness." On p. 458, note, I say: "Aeneas is, of course, the classical example of the love-sick hero," and I then point out the passage in the Old French *Enéas* (which Crestien certainly knew as he did the Classical original), which brings into relation *amors* and *repose*. In fact, one of the objects of my study was to show Crestien's use of the *matière de Rome*. See p. 485: "if Crestien . . . saw fit to follow the clerical tradition in his prologue, he doubtless followed it also in the composition of his work." Subsequently in *Rom.* XLIV. 1 ff.—an article not mentioned by Ogle—I elaborated this point of view; namely, that in practically all of his works Crestien used Classical material.

When, therefore, I say (p. 458, note) that the "Dido-situation is *not* that of the *Erec*," the obvious meaning is: the Virgilian story *so far as it relates to Dido* is not that of the *Erec* (not, as Ogle represents me, p. 18, as saying: "the Aeneas-Dido story as told by Virgil"); for, as I proceed to show (*l. c.*), the Dido-situation has a parallel in the *Ivain*, in the Laudine-situation, and I point out more or less the analogies, leaving it to the intelligent and openminded reader to draw the conclusions. If this be not sufficient to make my meaning clear, let Professor Ogle turn to the *Erec*, vs. 5339, where the poet describes the Aeneas tale as depicted on Enide's saddle-bows:

Comant Eneas vint de Troie,
 Comant a Cartage a grant joie
 Dido an son lit le reçut,
 Comant Eneas la deçut,
 Comant ele por lui s'ocist, etc.

Clearly, Crestien knew the Aeneas story when he wrote the *Erec*, and I have no doubt he realized that Aeneas was "uxorious," even if he does not state the fact.

At the same time (see section II of my article), he also knew Wace's *Brut*, in which Cador elaborates the danger of "sloth" in connection with love; and what is of more importance, since this regards his own story-material, Crestien knew the fairy-mistress plot (containing the "uxoriousness" theme) inasmuch as he reproduces it—in great part at least—in the Mabonagrain episode. Of this more in a moment. Let me state here only that I agree with Ogle that Crestien could have known the "uxoriousness" theme from Classical literature. Where I differ from Ogle, and where he should have seen that I differ from him, is in admitting that the theme was also inherent in the poet's source: the story

Que devant rois et devant contes
 Depecier et corronpre suelent
 Cil qui de conter vivre vuelent.

On p. 11 Professor Ogle says: "That Chrétien was, moreover, perfectly familiar with our theme is shown by a passage in *Ivain*, 2484 sq., where Gawain rebukes Ivain for uxoriousness, and no better statement of the text can be found than vv. 2484-6:

"Seroiz vos or de ceus
 Qui por lor fames valent mains?"

Precisely! See my pages 457, note 3, and 458, note 1, where this analogy is first mentioned. But the *Ivain* (see Professor Brown's *Ivain, a Study*) is the very romance in which the "uxoriousness" is fundamental; that is, a part of the source—the difference being that in *Ivain* Gauvain warns the hero against the fault of which Erec is actually guilty. Thus, the *Ivain* illustrates my contention, and not Ogle's. That Crestien was aided in elaborating this theme, in the *Erec* as well as the *Ivain*, by his knowledge of the

Classics is a probability I have never questioned—quite the contrary.

Finally, as to the fairy-mistress source. In my opinion, Philopot (*Rom.*, XXV, 258 ff.), Brown (*Iwain*, 133 ff.) and Ehrismann (*Beiträge*, XXX, 39) have shown that the *Erec* contains the familiar Otherworld situation. Compare my section III and the words I quote of the *fée* in *Bran*:

“Do not fall on a bed of sloth,
Let not thy intoxication overcome thee”;

also the “murmur of the companions” in the Imram of *Maelduin*.

On p. 28 Professor Ogle practically admits this fact: “. . . the other world [sic], such a hint as we have, for example, in the *Joie de la Cour*.” But on p. 7, note 2, he says with reference to the Mabonagrain episode: “I prefer to assign it to some version of the enchanted princess story; so Foerster, *l. c.*, p. xxiii, and Kittredge, *A Study of Gawain [sic] and the Green Knight*, pp. 48-9.”¹⁰ Which view is the reader to take? If we are to accept the latter, and this appears to be Ogle's wish, I need only repeat my answer to Foerster (my article, p. 460): “We must reverse Foerster's statement: ‘das bekannte Märchenmotiv von der Befreiung einer Jungfrau aus der Gefangenschaft eines Riesen,’ since Mabonagrain and not his *amie* is the real captive.” See Brown, *op. cit.*, 100, note: “In this story, it will be seen, the opposing warrior is actually subject to the *fée* (practically her creature), just as must have been the case in the more primitive forms of the Celtic Otherworld tale.”

Now if Crestien knew the “uxoriousness” situation from one part of his source (and of this there is little doubt), he could easily have transferred it to the other part of his romance—in order to get the contrast between “his two groups of lovers (see above).” While this is always *possible*, I do not by any means consider it as *necessary*. For, as I endeavored to show, somewhat summarily it is true (see pp. 450, note 1 and 468-469), the first

¹⁰ But see Kittredge, p. 237, where the “substitution of enchantment” is explained as “due to rationalizing.” For what a Celtic scholar has to say, see Windisch, ch. LXVI, “Das Wunderbare in der Erzählung von Gereint,” in the *Abhandl. der Sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften, philol. hist. Klasse*, XXIV, 6, 1912.

part of the romance, the so-called Sparrow-hawk Adventure, does contain "hints" (to use Ogle's excellent word) of the Otherworld tale. As follows:

1. In various features (see p. 450, note) of the versions of this adventure that have come down to us;
2. in the casual induction by means of a "dwarf" and an "insult," and in the type of contest itself (see the admirable article of Cross in *MP*, XII (1915), especially, pp. 639 ff.);
3. in the mention of Ider, son of Nu, a familiar Otherworld figure (see p. 469, note);
4. in the oppression of Enide's father, himself a not unlikely parallel to the Hospitable Host (see Brown, *passim*, for this term);
5. when taken *in connection with* other details, in the description of Enide (see my citations from Celtic as well as Latin literature; in *Thèbes*, which Ogle, p. 8, note, adduces against me, the women described are called *fées*, see p. 452, note 1. This reference alone shows the pertinence of my comparison of Enide to a *fée*); finally,
6. in Crestien's account (see my explanation, p. 481) of the hunt of the White Stag, itself a common induction motive to the fairy-mistress episode (see Cross, *l. c.*, and Kittredge, p. 232).

Thus, while the Sparrow-hawk Adventure appears in Crestien in a rationalized form, or, to quote again my own words, "as an adventure of chivalry, pure and simple, in which the hero wins a name and a bride (p. 469)," it is wrong to say that "in the Erec-Enide story proper . . . there is no such hint [of the Otherworld adventure], no hint that Enide was a *fée*, no hint that Erec was mad (Ogle p. 82¹¹)." And let us not forget:

1. That Crestien indicates that he had a "popular" source;
2. that no good reason exists for excluding the Mabonagrain episode, thus the Otherworld story, from this source; and
3. that the Otherworld story contains the theme of "uxoriousness" coupled with that of "*soveraynètee*," however much it may be obscured in the Mabonagrain version.

¹¹ I, of course, never said or thought "that Erec's land, where he and Enide lived their life of dalliance and ease, was originally the other world." On the motive of "madness" see Smirnov, *Revue Celtique*, XXXIII (1912), 132 ff., and my reference to the article in question (p. 470, note).

If we once grant some such background for Crestien's plot, then it seems clear to me why Crestien should have emphasized again the "uxoriousness" theme, set up the claim that others were spoiling the tale, and developed it in accordance with his knowledge of the Classics (on which Professor Ogle throws additional light¹²) and the demands of mediaeval society. If a modern analogy is desired—since Corneille's name has been mentioned—Corneille offers a parallel. The *Cid* is based on a Spanish source containing the theme of honor; this theme Corneille elaborated according to other non-Spanish sources and the ideals of his time. Crestien is far from possessing Corneille's "art." His *Erec* bristles with inconsistencies of detail. But his main issue seems to me clear: his chief character progresses from an assertion of sovereignty to a demonstration of valor to a full recognition of his wife's love. Erec's *amie* is also, and worthily so, his *fame*.

W. A. NITZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹² On p. 12 Ogle appropriately quotes Walter Map. Gaston Paris, *l. c.*, had quoted him, but in a Celtic connection.

"Quant à l'idée qu'il est honteux de renoncer aux combats pour se livrer au bonheur domestique, et que le séjour à la maison est ce qu'il y a de plus contraire à l'honneur d'un guerrier, elle est le fond même de la société galloise au XII siècle. Tous les Gallois passaient leur vie à se battre, regardaient la vie sans combats comme une lacheté, et ne craignaient rien tant que de mourir dans leur lit: In thoro turpe, in bello mori decus reputant (Girard de Barri, *Descr. Cambr.*, c. 8)—Improperium filio si pater sine vulnere decessit (Gautier Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, Dist., II, c. 23)." See Paris' note, p. 165. For an Irish parallel see *Ir. Texte, Extraband, Einl.*, XXXIV ff.

THE VISION OF THURKILL AND SAINT JAMES OF COMPOSTELLA

THE vision of Thurkill was related in a condensed form by Matthew Paris and Roger of Wendover. They left out whatever was unintelligible, and left in what was familiar and edifying. It has been published by H. L. D. Ward from the original manuscript in the British Museum, which was written probably by Ralph of Coggeshall.¹ Possibly the abbot, acquainted with the popular Visions of Heaven and Hell, interpolated a few bits, but the narrative records, as Ward saw, an actual experience of the Sussex husbandman.

The interest of the record is threefold: first, in connection with other medieval Visions of Heaven and Hell, it has not been carefully studied, and possibly not at first hand; secondly, it bears all the marks of a dream-psychology, and would be highly interesting for psycho-analysis; thirdly, the experience was the fruit of a long desire to go on a pilgrimage to S. James of Compostella and preserves fragments of current pilgrim's lore, affording some odd bits of evidence about the state of the Apostle's church in the thirteenth century. It is in this aspect that the present writer desires to explain and illustrate, a little, some passages of the text, with the idea, furthermore, of contributing to the realization, if not to the elucidation, of that vast mass of strictly oral tradition which slowly circulated and washed about during the Middle Age, and in which must be sought the explanation of many hard places in textual or iconographic criticism. After Homilies, the literature of Visions affords perhaps most often insight into these things. The whole field is obscure and difficult; that region, especially, where iconography touches on folklore, is like the road of Hop o' my Thumb's return; the birds have eaten up most of the crumbs.

As Ward's translation is rather inaccessible, it is quoted freely, exactly, and consecutively, omissions being indicated by the usual signs.

¹ H. L. D. Ward, *The Vision of Thurkill*, in *Journal of the Archaeological Association*, XXXI (London, 1875).

"In the Bishopric of London, in the village called Stidstede, there was a simple rustic named Thurkill, industrious at his work and given to hospitality, so far as his means allowed him. It happened that after the hour of Vespers on the Vigil of S. Simon and S. Jude, which was then a Friday, he was trenching his little field which he had sown on the same day, in order to drain off the waters of a flood of rain. Suddenly, raising his eyes, he sees a man a long way off coming up to him. And he had even then just begun to repeat the Lord's Prayer, and he wondered to see the man instantly stand before him. And the stranger bade him finish his prayer: and then they began to talk together. The stranger asked where he could pass the night: and Thurkill began to name this or that neighbor, but ended by proffering his own hospitality. Then the stranger answered, 'Thy wife has already received two poor women: and I do not yet seek to be housed, for I am bound for the province of Danesei. And I shall return thence tonight: and then I will visit thee and lead thee to thy Lord S. James, to whom thou has already turned in prayer.'"

"*Quem devote jam requisisti,*" "whom thou hast already sought in prayer," says Ward in his summary in the *Catalogue of Romances*,² and suggests, on a subsequent page, "If Thurkill had ever gone to Compostella, the fact would probably have been stated here; but perhaps he may have visited one of the nearer shrines of S. James by way of pilgrimage; even if no further off than Saffron Walden, where the abbey was dedicated to the Virgin and S. James." It seems more likely that Thurkill had keenly desired to go to Compostella and already appealed to S. James in the matter; from DuCange it appears possible to render the verb "put it up to S. James." Probably he could not afford the journey. The seventeenth of the Miracles of S. James relates the similar case of a young man in the diocese of Laon, a furrier by trade, who supported his mother, and could not afford the journey for a long time. Thurkill, because he wanted to go, would have talked with all sorts of pilgrims, and picked up odd bits and phrases, not only about the Compostella pilgrimage but also about Rome and Jerusalem.

"I am Julian the Harbourer, and I am sent to fetch thee, and to show thee secret mysteries. Hasten home, then, and make ready for thy journey." And with that he vanished. Thurkill went home

² Ward, *Catalogue of Romances in the British Museum*, I, pp. 565-70; 11, 506-17.

at once: and he washed his head and feet, though against the will of his wife, the day being a Friday. And he found the two women lodged in his house."

These women were pilgrims, probably, for though they were not expected beforehand Thurkill took them as a matter of course.

"Then he lay down, in a bed outside his bedroom, which he had already used for a month, and fell asleep. And when all were asleep in their beds, S. Julian stood by Thurkill, and awoke him, saying 'It is time to depart.' And when Thurkill began to rise, the saint said, 'Let thy body rest here awhile, only thy Soul will depart with me. But that thy friends may not think thee dead, I will send a breath of life into thee.' And so saying he breathed into Thurkill's mouth: and then both, as it seemed to the man, left the house, and set forth straight towards the east. And thus for two days and nights the body of the man lay senseless and motionless, as if it were sunken in a deep sleep." . . . "Thurkill's spirit, being now freed from the flesh, followed S. Julian in the likeness of his body, clad in its usual clothes. He only remarked one change in himself, that he breathed quicker than usual. They journeyed towards the east, as far as the middle of the world". . . .

Here Rome cuts across the dream, and the close of the sentence continued below is explained by the title of a chapter in the Pilgrim's Guide of Aymery Picaud, which, like the Book of the Miracles of S. James, is a part of the *Codex Calixtinus* or Book of S. James, preserved integral at Compostella, and in copies elsewhere, wholly or in part.³ "Of the Three Hospices of the World," is the title of the fourth chapter, which begins by praising God for the Three Pillars that sustain God's poor in the world, which are three hospices, one at Jerusalem, one on the Mount of Joy (*Mont Gaudii*, whence the pilgrims first saw Rome) and the third that of S. Cristina in the Port of Aspe, between France and Spain. Thurkill and Aymery may both have encountered the phrase in sermons; it must have been a part of the preacher's stock in trade.

". . . They entered a basilica, the pediment of which was supported by only three columns. The Basilica was large and fine, but without any solid walls, the sides being arched like a monastic cloister."

³ Fidel Fita and Julian Vinson, *Le Codex de S. Jacques de Compostelle, Livre IV*, Paris, Maisonneuve, 1882.

It is more than a coincidence that just such a strange building still stands in Navarre, not five miles from Puente la Reina, where the four roads of pilgrims meet "and thenceforth one way goeth to S. James." This is the basilica of Auriz, called also the church of Eunáte, a Templars' foundation of the twelfth century, and around the octagonal edifice stands a roofless, open cloister, quite as Thurkill understood it.⁴

"But against the northern side there stood an outer wall, though not more than six feet high. There was a fabric in the midst of the Basilica, which looked like a vast fount: and out of it arose a great flame, not heating the place but lighting it up throughout with the splendour of noonday. This illumination proceeded from the tithings of the just."

This is the so-called ark, or alms chest, which stood in a conspicuous place near the high altar, at Santiago. Sr. Lopez Ferreiro⁵ has published in full, from the archives of the cathedral, the thirteenth century regulations which governed the vergers, beadles, and clerks in charge of the altar, the ark, the relics, etc. At the hour of the earliest mass a clerk was to take his stand at the ark, likewise a beadle with a wand, and to tap the pilgrims going by, and then call to them in all languages, and he who gave out the indulgences or pardons was to name the ark before any other of the honours of the church, and as it was named, the clerk called out in set phrases, French, Italian, Gallegan and English, exhorting them to give for the works and for S. James. It should be added that the light which shines from this ark in the Vision is to be identified with a great light that lights up the church in Miracle XVIII, and that illuminates the crypt in Aymery's Guide.

"Here S. James wearing a mitre received Thurkill as his pilgrim, and calling up S. Dominick, the warden of the Basilica, he bade him join S. Julian and show to this man his pilgrim the habitations of the wicked and the good."

S. James wears a mitre as Metropolitan and Primate, and this detail alone would connect the Vision with Compostella. "S.

⁴ Lampérez, *Historia de la Arquitectura Cristiana Española en la Edad Media*, I. 603.

⁵ Lopez Ferreiro, *Historia de la S. A. M. Iglesia de Santiago de Compostela*, Vol. V., Appendix, pp. 64-67.

Dominick," as Ward points out, is he "of the Causeway, who had built the great bridge and repaired the road for the pilgrims and whose name had been given to the town of S. Domingo de la Calzada," where indeed he lived and died, "the scene of the legend of the dead cock that crowed." He points out also that the copyist in another MS. of the Vision, and the two historians, Roger and Matthew, who know nothing of this Spanish saint, alter the name to Dominus and Domninus.⁶ Thurkill, however, knew all about him, and his Causeway is the whole of the Pilgrim's road, the Camino Frances, or the Camino de Santiago. It is, of course, a short road to salvation. This is also the name of the Milky Way. And as by a medieval tradition preserved for us in the *Cursor Mundi*⁷ the feet of Adam and Eve, when they came away from Paradise, scorched the grass, and a burnt path through the valley sufficed to guide Seth back thither when he went to the Gate to beg for the Oil of Mercy, so here, contrariwise, the path of the blessed souls is thick green grass, as the text says more than once.

"Having said so, he vanished. 'This Basilica,' S. Julian said, 'is the assembling place of all departed Spirits, founded at the intercession of the Virgin and dedicated to her, and it is called the "Congregation of Souls."' Within it the man saw many white Souls with youthful faces: and their feet never wore nor withered the green grass that formed its floor."

In these two sentences you strike down into deep springs of folklore: suffice it to say here that the Western Land which is Compostela de Galicia is more than once identified with the land of the dead, that souls were accustomed to make the pilgrimage after death as well as in the body, so that the Camino de Santiago, as just stated, is likewise the path of innumerable multitudes of souls across the sky. Here may be recognized just such an assembling-place of the dead as Procopius mentions on the Breton Coast.⁸ Finally, there are traces in the medieval ritual of the cathedral, especially in the custom of loosing doves in the church at Candlemas, when intercession was made for the souls of unborn or unbaptized

⁶ Matthew Paris, *Cronica Majora*, Rolls series, vol. II, pp. 497 seq. Roger of Wendover, *Flores Historiarum*, Rolls series, vol. II, pp. 16 seq.

⁷ Early English Text Society, *Cursor Mundi*, vols. 57, 99, 101, p. 80.

⁸ Scott, *Count Robert of Paris*, I, 120.

infants, which suggests that the Good Lady, and her successor the Mother of God, had a certain place at Compostella. There is a Gallegan belief, taken down from the lips of the living by one now alive, that after the Judgment Day Galicia is to become the place of rest and bliss, the Paradise of souls, and that all the dead, restored to their bodies, beautified and incorruptible, shall remain perpetually at the age of thirty-three years, three months and five days.⁹ In the tympanum of the western porch at Santiago, which was built by Master Matthew in 1188, the feet of the Apocalyptic Christ rest on thick leafage once green; so do S. James's on the post below, and those of the prophets and apostles on the jambs; and I know of no other case. The northern one of the three doors shows, in the archivolt, little figures among green leafage, the interpretation of which was never established quite satisfactorily before. Dom Roulin¹⁰ had already urged that this would be the Paradise of the Souls Expectant,—the Green Pasture of the twenty-third psalm. In the Alexandrian liturgy that *locus pascuale* is “virentia et amoena loca paradisi.” Thurkill clinches it.

“But outside, when he was afterwards led beyond the northern wall, he saw many spotted souls striving to reach the wall, and the whiter they were, the closer they would come to it; and in the distance he saw many souls that were black all over. Now there is a pit near this wall, and it vomited a stifling smoke fed by the tithings of the unjust, and twice, as Thurkill passed the pit, he was stung by the smoke so that he coughed in great pain. And twice at the same hour the body that he had left behind him coughed, as those who were watching around it testified. ‘Methinks,’ quoth S. Julian, ‘thy crops are not fully tithed.’ Thurkill pleaded his poverty, but the Saint replied that full tithings bring full harvests.

“From the east end of the Basilica he saw two walls stretching, with fierce purgatorial flames between them. This fiery passage leads to an immense pool, and here all the souls that have just emerged from fire are plunged into the coldest and saltiest of all waters. Last comes a long bridge, bristling with stakes and nails, which every soul must cross before reaching the Mount of Joy. And high aloft upon this mount there stands a wonderful church, that seems large enough to hold all the people in the world.”

⁹ Murguía, *Galicia*, p. 237, in *España, sus Monumentos y Artes*, Barcelona, 1888.

¹⁰ Dom. E. A. Roulin, *Revue de l'Art Chrétien*, March, 1895.

It is hardly necessary to point out, here, what Thurkill carried over from other Visions, recounted doubtless in many a Lenten and Advent sermon. Indeed, the day being within the week of All-Souls', he is likely to have listened to something of the sort the last time he went to church. The imminence of that festival, and its part in determining his vision, has not I think been duly considered. The waters of bitterness, the bridge of dread, interrupt the dream of the pilgrimage of S. James, and then appears the Mount of Joy, which was a hill about three miles east of Santiago, called also S. Marcos, whence the towers could be clearly seen. It is named in the fourth Miracle of S. James,¹¹ and by every traveler down to Guillaume Manier and after. By a process very common in dreams, the church of the Apostle is split into two: it is standing there large enough to contain all the people in the world, and it is also the Basilica.

"But now let us return to the Basilica. S. Dominick sprinkled the souls there with holy water and they were even whiter than before. And lo, even the first hour of the dawning Saturday, Michael the Archangel appeared together with S. Peter and S. Paul. And S. Michael led the white souls along a narrower grassy path between the flames and across the pool and over the bridge and up to the Mount of Joy." . . .

The episode of the weighing of the souls is omitted for brevity as having little to yield in the present inquiry.

"The weighing of the Souls lasted from the first hour of the Saturday down to the ninth hour. And whilst it was still going on S. Julian led Thurkill unhurt, over the grassy path, between the purgatorial flames." . . .

As the next episode in the dream, a fiend comes galloping on a black horse over stock and stone amid shouts of triumph from a crowd of his brother fiends. This is the soul of one of the Barons of England, who had died the night before without confession. By virtue of an inversion not uncommon in dreams, this must be referred to the familiar figure of S. James on a great white horse, Santiago Matamoros, as he appeared at the battle of Clavijo¹² and drove back the Moors to the war-cry of "Santiago, cierra España!"

¹¹ *Acta Sanctorum*, July, VI, under S. James Major: Miracles of S. James, printed from the *Codex Calixtinus*.

¹² And also Simancas.

Then S. Dominick takes him to see the games, to a place something quite too surprisingly like a bull-ring, being fashioned, presumably, after the Roman arena. There was one at Nîmes and one at Verona, that pilgrims might have known; that of Sagunto is set in the sloping side of a hill, like this one; above all there was, for the Roman pilgrims, the Colosseum. The souls sitting round "on seats in every yard," recall the old prints of Nîmes choked up with houses. "And also there were other seats, fixed into the walls, where the fiends sat grinning as if at some merry show." The wretched souls enact a sort of Morality pageant: types receive the typical punishment.

"And as it began to dawn, toward the first day of the week:" the verse that haunts our ears from the Easter lesson, haunted men's ears in the thirteenth century:

"And now when the Sunday was dawning upon the earth, the saints brought Thurkill back to the Basilica. He took no count of time himself, but he learned the hour from the Saints. S. Dominick received his *aspersorium* again on entering, and sprinkled the new Congregation, and the souls were whiter than before. Then Thurkill was led over the grassy path, past the fires and the pool, and over the bridge, and up the Mount of Joy, till he reached the forecourt of the church upon its summit. The beautiful Gate of the West stood always open [the *Gloria* had been in place nearly twenty years] and through this Gate S. Michael led the pure white souls. But in the forecourt stood the Souls who had completed their purgatorial penances, each eagerly waiting his turn of admission." . . .

"Going around the church, Thurkill found on the south side the wearied souls who waited upon the prayers of the living, and on the north side they lay on their faces with their arms outstretched toward the church groveling upon sharp stones, swept by the blast of a dismal wind. And S. Michael allowed the man to visit the church. And he saw throngs of pure white souls, and looking up the steps toward the east end, he saw them whiter and whiter still."

The present writer has cause to believe, and hopes to present the evidence, in a place more fit, that the western end of the church of the Apostle was planned originally like that of Le Puy, where the steep street ends in the steep stairs that go under the nave and end before the high altar, so that the crowds in the street, before the staircase was altered, could see the elevation of the Host. This passage confirms the theory. Thurkill, standing outside, looks into and through the church.

The perpetual insistence on the white souls, their constant recurrence, may be traced in part to their importance in the *Gloria* of Master Matthew, as angels above the great piers carry and caress them, and the multitude that no man can number appears packed into the upper curves of the tympanum. Especially when the carving was all painted, their position would fix them in the recollection, and bring them forward in the tale, of every pilgrim, as still in the works of tourists who have looked at the door. This essay will have been wasted unless the reader by now perceives how large a part of this sort of literature can only be understood by knowing what people said, and, further, what people saw.

“And here the souls abide; and every day, at certain hours [the Canonical], they hear the music of heaven, and this music is their food. And there are many shrines in the church, where the saints gather their votaries, in order to present them hereafter before the throne of God. Then S. Michael brought Thurkill back once more to the purgatorial pool. And the whole place was drained; and the steps to the bed of the pool, that had made the water lie in different depths, were now dry and clean, and the souls stood on their appointed steps as if they were at church. For the Angel S. Uriel, whose name means the Fire of God and who watches over all the souls in Purgatory, lest evil spirits come and increase their torments, this angel I saw open a certain sluice after the ninth hour every Saturday, that the souls may be left in peace throughout the Sunday. But when Monday dawns, he opens another sluice towards the north, and the pool is soon filled to the brim with the cold salt water.” . . .

Ward points out how this “was no doubt influenced by his remembrance of his own field, which he had been trying to drain of a flood.” The incident of the intermission goes back, of course, to the *Apocalypse of Paul*.

“And now the Saints and Thurkill left the pool again and passed the church. And proceeding eastwards they reached a pleasant dale, glowing with flowers and birds, and watered by a bright fountain. And four springs, each of a different kind and colour, gushed out of the fountain and ran far away, until they joined again in one full stream. And above the fountain stretched a vast and vigorous tree, that bore every sort of flower and fruit. And beside the fountain reclined a man of gigantic form and noble aspect, decked in a many-coloured garment from his feet up to his breast. And he seemed

to laugh with one eye and weep with the other. 'This man,' said S. Michael, 'is the first parent of the human race, even Adam.' . . ."

The orientation throughout, it should be said, is that of Vincent of Beauvais, and is symbolic: the south is merciful, the north bitter, *ex oriente lux*. Adam with one eye weeping and laughing with another, is a confused memory from the *Protevangelium of James*: "Mary, how is it that I see in thy face at one time laughter and at another sorrow? And Mary said to Joseph: Because I see two peoples with my eyes; the one weeping and lamenting, the other rejoicing and exulting." This is Thurkill's, not Ralph's of Coggeshall!

"And now going a little further on, they came to a temple of gold having a gate set with precious stones. And this temple excelled all that they had seen in beauty and brilliance. And within it was a shrine where three virgin martyrs were enthroned, and their names were S. Catherine, S. Margaret, and S. Ositha."

To the Priory of S. Osith were due certain moneys, and Roger Picot, Thurkill's old landlord, being then dead, was anxious they should be paid. But S. Osith, or S. Sitha, is perpetually confused with S. Zita of Lucca, who was the patroness of serving maids and herself of that calling, who was born in 1217 and died in 1278; and it is an odd coincidence, though unfortunately it is no more, that a chapel dedicated to S. Zita survives even at this day, in the town of Cacabelos, which was the property of Santiago, on the road of the pilgrims. It serves, at least, to show the sharp difference between coincidence and causality.

"But now, when Thurkill was most eagerly gazing at their beauty, suddenly S. Michael said to S. Julian 'Take this man back to his body; or the cold water which these around him are pouring into his mouth, will choke him to death.' And lo, at once he was in the body again, he knew not how, and sitting up in bed he said 'Benedicite.'"

GEORGIANA GODDARD KING

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

THE COMPOSITION OF THE OLD FRENCH PROSE *LANCELOT*

(Continued from vol. IX, page 395)

DIVISIONS OF THE *LANCELOT*

Having established in definite form the allusions to the other members of the Vulgate cycle in the *Lancelot*—also the allusions to the *Perlesvaus* and the *Livre d'Artus* of MS. 337—and having thus rendered available the evidence regarding the evolution of this romance which such allusions may furnish, I shall now endeavor to determine what are the different divisions of the work and, as far as possible, the order of their composition.

I will say at once that, in my judgment, the original stock of the *Lancelot* romance consisted simply of the story of the hero's birth, his parents' misfortunes, his being carried off and reared by the Lady of the Lake, his going to Arthur's court and early adventures there, his falling in love with Guinevere, his first encounters with Galehaut and their subsequent friendship, the love-intrigues of the two friends with the Queen and the Lady of Malehaut, respectively, the whole ending with the death of Galehaut (IV, 155). In other words, the section of the *Lancelot* which has often been called the *Galehaut* (the fatal book, *Galeotto*, which in Dante's *Inferno*, V, 137, was responsible for the tragedy of Paolo and Francesca) seems to me—after we have excluded the interpolations, already discussed, and certain additions, yet to be named—to be the portion of the *Lancelot* which was first composed. Let us first take up this section.

I. THE SO-CALLED *Galehaut*

Within this section we have, of course, the interpolations which I have discussed above. Furthermore, we should reckon certainly as later additions, I believe, the following passages:

1. Claudas's wars with his barons,¹⁰⁶ IV, 47–105.

¹⁰⁶ One might be inclined to regard the episode (pp. 41–47) of the friar, Adragains li bruns, who, on behalf of Lancelot's mother, upbraids Arthur with

It is incredible that the author of the original *Lancelot* should have hardly started his romance before abandoning the hero of it altogether, to devote himself to this long digression concerning the strife between Claudas, King of the Desert Land (who had been the cause of the death of Lancelot's father, Ban), and his vassals. This procedure is against all precedent in fiction of the Middle Ages or any other period.¹⁰⁷ The origin of the strife, to be sure, was the fear which Pharien and his fellow-barons entertained in regard to the treatment which Claudas might mete out to Lionel and Bohort, Lancelot's first cousins and sons of the elder Bohort. Not only, however, does Lancelot virtually disappear from this part of the narrative, but, after the earlier incidents, almost the same thing may be said of his cousins. A marked difference of style confirms the suspicions which are raised by the considerations just mentioned. No one, I fancy, has ever read the *Lancelot* without being struck by the strength of style of this Claudas episode,¹⁰⁸ as compared with that of the episodes that follow (Lancelot's early adventures, his falling in love with the Queen, etc.). When we reach the latter, we feel that we have passed from a genuine, vivid picture not avenging her wrongs, as being also a later insertion, probably by the author of V, 318 ff. (Arthur's wars against Claudas); for there Arthur does, in effect, help Lancelot in regaining his inheritance—only nothing is said of his entering on the war to redress the wrongs of Lancelot's parents. Besides, the style of III, 41 ff., strikes me as much superior to that of V, 318 ff.

¹⁰⁷ In Thomas's *Tristan*, Chrétien's *Cliges*, etc., we have, it is true, preliminary narratives of the love affairs of the hero's parents, but this is a different matter.

¹⁰⁸ In the *ROMANIC REVIEW*, IV, 464 f. (1913), I commented on this. The passage was written, though not published, before E. Brugger's remarks on the same subject, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XL, 55 f. (1912), appeared. Contrasting the style of this part of the *Lancelot* with that of the "höfische Romane," he says of the former: "Er ist viel kraftvoller, männlicher, nicht so flach, nicht manieriert." He likens it to the style of the *chansons de geste* at their best. The historical elements in this opening part of the *Lancelot*, such as they are, however, do not come, in my opinion, from oral tradition, as Brugger believes, but from the usual chronicles of the early history of France.

It is to be noted that "Claudas de la deserte" appears among Arthur's enemies (though merely as a name) in the continuation of Chrétien's *Perceval* by Wauchier de Denain, ll. 33638 f., 33724, and Wauchier most probably antedates the *Lancelot*. On the other hand, we have no critical edition of his continuation, and so the name of Claudas, after all, may have been introduced into it later from the *Lancelot* by a scribe or redactor. In other parts of this continuation we have undoubtedly long intercalations.

of the feudal ages in their most strenuous aspect to the fantastic extravagances and artificial conventions of the regular *roman courtois*. Every one who has any acquaintance with the *chansons de geste* must have recognized, too, the influence of those works on this narrative of feudal strife, not only in its general masculine vigor, but in such special features as the swashbuckling performances of the youthful Lionel.¹⁰⁹ The author of pp. 47 ff. probably subjected also to a redaction the earlier narrative covered by pp. 1-47.

Inasmuch as there is reason, as we shall see, to suppose that Bohort, and hence, doubtless, Lionel, did not appear in the primitive *Lancelot*, III, 47-105, which is closely connected with these two cousins of Lancelot, could not have been inserted until after their introduction into the story.

After p. 105, Claudas and his subjects are dropped from the romance and take no further part in the action¹¹⁰ until V, 256 ff., 318 ff. (the war of Lancelot and Arthur against him), where a much feebler hand brings him into the story again.

The writer has taken the usual precautions to make the intercalation fit in with the surrounding narrative, so that no contradiction is to be detected here. The brief episode of Banin (Ban's godson) at Arthur's court, pp. 108-111, however, being pitched in a different and lower style, is more likely to be the work of a redactor, although it, too, serves the purpose of connecting the new element in the narrative with the old.

2. Hector, Lancelot's bastard half-brother, whose adventures begin III, 277, is, no doubt, a later addition¹¹¹ to the romance—

¹⁰⁹ In general, however, there are some excellent pictures of childhood in the episode. A wavering in the relations of Pharien to Claudas that is not altogether consistent has, also, been noted by Paul Märtens in *Eduard Boehmer's Romanische Studien*, V, 637 f. (1880).

¹¹⁰ The names of Claudas and Lambegues occur each some six or seven times in the intervening narrative.

¹¹¹ He enters the narrative, as I have said (unnamed, at first), at III, 277. The episode at Les Mares occurs III, 255 ff. Here Hector kills Mathaaliz, son of the old lord of Les Mares, and saves Ladomas, the other son. They are both his half-brothers according to the later portions of the *Lancelot*, but at this point there is no hint to that effect. Hector is first called Hector des Mares at IV, 235—that is to say, in the part following the *Charete* section, and afterwards in this volume at pp. 321, 332, 354. Along with Gawain, etc., he is im-

quite possibly, from some preëxisting metrical romance—and, consequently, the episodes in which he is the chief actor, in all probability, did not belong to the *Lancelot* in its original form. As will be seen further on, this is demonstrably true of Bohort's adventures, so it is probably true of Hector's. The fact that the story of Hector's conception and relationship to Lancelot is first told, V, 117—so towards the end of our romance—seems convincing proof that he came later into the *Lancelot*.

3. The episode of the False Guinevere, IV, 10–81, which is skilfully interwoven with the story of Lancelot, Guinevere and Galehaut, is, in all probability, a later accretion of the *Lancelot* romance. It has, itself, been interpolated, as explained above, with Galehaut's dreams and Baudemagus's regency. The main features of this episode are as follows: According to a plot which was framed by Bertholai, a knight who had been disinherited by Guinevere's father, Leodegan of Carmelide, an illegitimate daughter of Leodegan by the wife of his seneschal (Cleodalis) claims that she is the true Guinevere. Bertholai testifies that she had actually wedded Arthur and had lain with him on her wedding-night, but that "au matin quant vous leuastes por aler a chambre" (p. 14) she had been spirited away and an impostor put in her place. Arthur postpones his decision in the case until he holds court at Bedingran at Candlemas. Before the appointed day, however, the False Guinevere, through her fellow-conspirators, kidnaps the King and imprisons him. He becomes infatuated with her, and is taken off to Carmelide, convinced of the truth of her accusations. Ultimately the question is submitted for decision to a judicial combat in Carmelide, in which Lancelot, single-handed, wins for the Queen, as against three knights, who represent her calumniator. Despite this vindication, Arthur, at the solicitation of his paramour, resolves that the Queen must leave the country. She goes off to Sorelois, where Galehaut has offered her refuge, and there is joined

prisoned, III, 412, in Camille's enchanted castle, but when Lancelot, pp. 425 ff., releases the captives, there is no mention of his being among them. At p. 429, however, we find him made a knight of the Round Table. P. Paris, III, 376, note, as cited at the beginning of this article, has already pointed out a similar instance of forgetfulness in another episode involving Hector—Lancelot does not learn till V, 117, that Hector was his half-brother, and we are first told the story of his conception in this same passage.

by Lancelot. The Pope commands Arthur to take his wife back. Later on the False Guinevere and her accomplice, Bertholai, are stricken with paralysis, through a visitation of God, and confess their crime. Guinevere is then restored to her rightful place as Arthur's consort.

We have here, of course, the old folk-tale *motif* of the Substituted Bride¹¹² imported into the story of Guinevere. There is no reason, however, to believe that it stood in the primitive *Lancelot*.¹¹³ It is totally alien to the conception of Guinevere's story in the rest of the romance, and is not referred to elsewhere.¹¹⁴ One may confidently, then, put it on the list of additions to the original *Lancelot*.

Still further, however, there is probably an intercalation within the False Guinevere episode, as was suggested by P. Paris, IV, 137 f., note. He remarks in that place that the account of Galehaut's summoning his parliament and the election of Baudemagus as governor of Sorelois in his absence (at Arthur's court), like the interpretation of Galahad's dreams, is not connected with the remainder of the narrative and is not found in the majority of the MSS.—hence is most likely intercalated. He does not indicate the downward limit of the passage which is thus missing from the majority of the MSS., but I presume that it extends through IV, 44, line 28 (Lancelot's wounding by Meleagant, son of Baudemagus). Baudemagus's governorship is at once completely forgotten, being never again mentioned in the romance.¹¹⁵ This strengthens the suspicion of interpolation.

Besides the passages just discussed, there are, very likely, a number of others in the so-called *Galehaut* section of the *Lancelot*, as in other sections, which should be counted among the expansions

¹¹² Cf. P. Arfert: *Das Motiv von der unterschobenen Braut*, Rostock dissertation, 1897. I infer from Sommer's silence that the False Guinevere episode stands, also, in the variant (unprinted) version of IV, 1–204.

¹¹³ Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXXVI, 208 (review section, 1910), expresses the opinion that it was not in the primitive *Lancelot*.

¹¹⁴ Many features of this episode, though not the folk-tale *motif*, are imitated in the *Mort Artu*. Cf. the remarks on this subject in my edition of that romance, pp. 284 ff.

¹¹⁵ The wounding of Lancelot by Meleagant is mentioned, IV, 157, near the beginning of the *Charete* section—with a view, no doubt, to the linking of that section with the so-called *Galehaut*.

of the original romance. Paulin Paris says of the episode of Gawain and the giant Carados:

“Le grand épisode où nous arrivons de l'enlèvement, de la quête et de la délivrance de messire Gauvain devait former, dans l'origine, un récit indépendant du roman en prose. C'était un de ces lais ou contes que les bardes et les jongleurs récitaient en plein air et de vive voix.”

Whether he is right or not in regard to this particular episode,¹¹⁶ there is, no doubt, justification for the common opinion that the *Lancelot* is made up, in part, of prose adaptations of earlier metrical romances, now lost,¹¹⁷ and materials drawn from these sources were, as we may confidently assume, incorporated in the *Lancelot* at different stages in its evolution. We know that we have in the earlier part of the so-called *Charete* section such an adaptation of Chrétien's *Lancelot*¹¹⁸ (or *Conte de la Charete*, as the poet, himself, calls it), which was added to the original *Lancelot*, and what is true of this part of the *Lancelot* is doubtless true of other parts (including many episodes in the *Galehaut*)—only in these latter cases the metrical originals have not survived to later times. Inasmuch, however, as these hypothetical romances which constituted sources of the *Galehaut*, as of the other divisions of the *Lancelot*, if they ever existed, have not survived, it would be unprofitable at this stage of our *Lancelot* studies to speculate in regard to matters

¹¹⁶ Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXXI², 252 f., regards the story, IV, 124, of Morgan's *amour* with Guinevere's cousin as based on a “lai de Guiomar.” In any event, the passage is too brief to possess any importance for the present discussion.

¹¹⁷ Brugger, *ibid.*, 276, conjectures that the primitive *Lancelot* was in verse, but the conjecture is unsupported by any evidence. With more plausibility he assumes, H. Morf, *Festschrift*, p. 76, note, a lost Sagremor romance. Fragments of a Middle High German romance, *Segremors*, are extant.

¹¹⁸ Since G. Paris's article, *Romania*, XII, 459 ff. (1883), the dependence of the *Charete* section on Chrétien has been generally accepted. Brugger, however, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXVIII, 3 ff., has tried to revive the idea that the two were derived from a common source. Arguing in this manner, one could easily prove that Tennyson's *Guinevere* is not based on Malory, but derived from a common source. A mediæval romancer had no more scruples about changing his originals than a modern poet has.

which from the nature of the case must always elude any exact determination.¹¹⁹

There is no ground at all for the view expressed by G. Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, II, i, 1004, to the effect that the *Galehaut* is later than the *Queste del Saint Graal*. We have seen already in the discussion above that the allusions to the *Queste* in the *Galehaut* are very few and, without exception, due to interpolation. Surely, if the *Queste* had been the older, we should not have had these few interpolated allusions—the whole work would have been colored by the *Queste*. Gröber, himself (p. 1002), recognizes the slenderness of the thread that connects such allusions with the general narrative of the *Galehaut*, but regards the episodes in this division relating to knights who figure also in the

¹¹⁹ Different, of course, from the question of these hypothetical prose renderings of lost romances that may be embodied in the *Lancelot* is that of its use of sources in the ordinary manner. I have noted V, 105 (the Dolorous Stroke that led to the devastation of Pelles's kingdom), 148 (the self-playing chessmen), as probably drawn from Wauchier de Denain, and V, 123 f. (the incident of the carols), as probably standing in the same relation to the *Meraugis de Portlesgues*. From Wauchier, too, ll. 15892 ff., the incident, III, 272 f., may be taken. In the former Arthur at the table leans in revery on a knife, and is filled with sadness. The knife slips and he is slightly wounded. This breaks his revery. Gawain sends to ask the cause of his melancholy. He replies that it is the treason of his barons. Offended by his accusation, the barons demand an explanation. It is because they have permitted Gifflet to remain in prison four years. Remorseful, the barons go to free Gifflet. We have the same situation in III, 272 ff., except that here the subject of Arthur's melancholy revery is the failure of his men to keep their oath about going on a quest for Lancelot. Moreover, Gawain's messenger (a girl, not a *varlet* as in Wauchier), when sent to inquire about his sad demeanor, arouses him by pulling the table-cloth from under the knife, though apparently without wounding him. The metrical romance, *L'Atre Perillos*, ll. 298 ff., has the same *motif*—taken, I believe, from Wauchier.

I have no doubt, furthermore, that the incident of the carrying off of the infant Lancelot by the Lady of the Lake and of her subsequent bringing him up is derived from the lost original of Ulrich von Zatzichoven's *Lanzelet*. Ulrich's *Pant* is the same as *Ban*, being, no doubt, the oblique form to a nominative *Banz* (variant for *Bans*). Sommer, p. xxi, Introduction to *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, is, of course, wrong when he speaks of the prose *Lancelot's* being the first work to make Lancelot Ban's son. F. Lot has pointed out, *Romania*, XXIV, 335 (1895), that the German poet's *Genewis* is identical with *Chrétien's Gomeret* (*Bans de Gomeret*, *Erec*, 1975) and with *Benoic* (which he strangely cites from the prose *Tristan*, rather than from the *Lancelot*), all three being alterations, as he conjectures, of *Gwynedd*, the Welsh name for North Wales.

Queste as a mere exploitation of characters who were prominent in the latter work, especially (it would seem) of Gawain and Hector; for Perceval, of course, is not a character in the *Galehaut*. The *Galehaut* (like the *Agravain*), he says, gives the "Jugendgeschichte" of these knights, as well as of Lancelot. Waiving for the moment the objection to his relative dating of the two works which I have already urged and which really puts his contention out of court, I will say that the deeds of Gawain and Hector in the *Galehaut* are not represented as *enfances*, and, besides, what motive would the author of the *Queste* have for creating a bastard half-brother for Lancelot and assigning him, after all, a subordinate rôle, such as Hector fills in that branch?

Brugger adopts and develops these identifications in his discussion of Alain de Gomeret, "Ein Beitrag zur arthurischen Namenforschung" in the Heinrich Morf *Festschrift* (Halle, 1905), pp. 53 ff.—only he proposes—justly, in my opinion—Old Breton *Guenet* (= Modern French *Vannes*) as the common original of the forms in question. To my mind, these identifications and Brugger's derivation are beyond dispute. Apart from the opening pages of the *Lancelot*, there is no use made of Ulrich's original in the romance, and even in these pages the *Lancelot* shows alterations, especially in representing Ban as losing his throne through an unprincipled enemy, rather than on account of his own tyranny. The change is due to the author's consideration for Lancelot, Ban's son. Brugger (*ibid.*, p. 84) identifies *Ban* with Modern Scotch *Bain*, but the sources of the respective names lie too far apart. On the other hand, if the name of Ban's kingdom has been so mercilessly mutilated, is not this likely to be the case with his own name, too? It was certainly much corrupted after our extant MS. tradition began—for the *Ras* (*Ras*), *Car de Gomeret* cited by Brugger (p. 56), are plainly variants of *Ban*—so why not before?

In this same article (p. 55, note 1, and p. 84) Brugger, adopting a suggestion of G. Paris's *Huth-Merlin*, vol. I, p. xlviii, note 3, identifies Hector des Mares with Torz li filz Ares, who occurs already in Chrétien's *Erec*, 1528, 1728. Brugger points out that three MSS. of *Erec* have the variant *Estorz* for *Et Torz* in the case of line 1528. But this is a slender basis for the superstructure of speculation which he erects, pp. 84 f. There are no such variants for line 1728, which is identical with 1528, and even in the case of l. 1528, *Et*, being required by the context, is certainly the right reading. There is no need, either, of identifying *Mares* with *Morois* (Scottish *Moray*). *Les Mares* was a perfectly legitimate name for a place or district, and hence for the castle of the lord who ruled over it. *Li Biaus Descouneus*, I should add, has twice (ll. 42, 5563): "Et Tors li fuis le roi Ares" (cf. G. P. Williams's edition, Oxford, 1915). The author took the line straight from Chrétien, so that this text supports the MSS. of *Erec* that begin l. 1528 with *Et*. So much for the name. As for the incidents connected with Hector in the *Lancelot*, Brugger does not even try to establish parallels for them in oral tradition.

I believe that Gröber is also wrong in the opinion which he still further expresses, to the effect that the *Galehaut* is later than the so-called *Charete* (*Charette*) section of the *Lancelot* (IV, 155 ff.), which immediately succeeds it. If this were true, we should expect to find in the former anticipatory references to the latter and incidents that are only completed in the latter. This, however, is not so. He cites (p. 1003) the character of Meleagant as introduced to unite the *Galehaut* with the *Charete*. We have seen, however, that the Baudemagus-Meleagant episode of the *Galehaut*, in all likelihood, did not belong to that section originally. In any event, this episode is not preliminary to anything related in the *Charete*,¹²⁰ but entirely independent of it, so that it cannot be taken as evidence that the latter was already in existence. Indeed, at IV, 40, in this episode, where, in accordance with Chrétien, an account is given of Gorre and how the exiles came there, no allusion at all is made to the fact that these matters are to play an important part further on in the narrative. On the other hand, we have a number of definite allusions to the *Galehaut* in the *Charete*: IV, 171 (Lancelot and the Ual as Faus Amants, IV, 117 ff.), 205 (Lancelot's prowess in the Bedingran combat, IV, 61 ff.), 209 (Morgan's drugging Lancelot and exchanging his ring for hers, IV, 139 ff.), 214 (Lancelot's killing Carados of the Dolerouse Tour, IV, 137). These are in addition to the allusions which occur at the very beginning of the *Charete* section, IV, 155 f. (Lancelot's frenzy and the deaths of Galehaut and the Lady of Malehaut), and which serve to link up directly the new division with the conclusion of the old.

In the formation of his opinion concerning the relative dating of the two sections, Gröber was evidently influenced by the fact that the earliest prose romances we have are, in all probability, the prose renderings of Robert de Borron's *Joseph* and *Merlin*.¹²¹ Hence

¹²⁰ The reference to the wounding of Lancelot by Meleagant at the beginning of the *Charete* section (IV, 157) connects the two sections, but the passage does not constitute an incident. It is simply like other allusions to the *Galehaut* in the *Charete*—only it was, doubtless, inserted later (i. e., at the time the Baudemagus-Meleagant episode was inserted in the *Galehaut*, or afterwards).

¹²¹ Sommer, p. xiv of the Introduction to his edition of the Vulgate cycle, assumes that the prose renderings of de Borron's poems were due to the model of the prose *Lancelot*. There is no evidence on which we can base a positive conclusion one way or the other, but it seems more likely that the shorter works

he inferred, not unnaturally, that the oldest part of the prose *Lancelot* was that which was based on Chrétien's *Lancelot*. There is nothing, however, to indicate that the prose adaptation of Chrétien's poem ever existed outside of the connection in which we see it in the *Lancelot*, and, as the evidence now stands, it seems to me that Gröber's opinion in regard to this matter ought to be rejected.

II. THE SO-CALLED *Charete*

Let us take up now the *Charete* section.

This section begins at IV, 155—that is to say, with the beginning of the prose adaptation of Chrétien's *Lancelot*—and the term is usually applied to the whole of the remaining narrative down to the end (p. 302) of Vol. IV in Sommer's edition (excluding the appendices)—*i. e.*, down to the end of what Sommer calls Part II. This stretch of narrative, however, has no more unity than any other considerable stretch of narrative in any other part of the *Lancelot*, and I have no doubt that it, too, is the production of different hands. The adaptation of Chrétien extends from IV, 155, to IV, 226, but within these bounds we have extraneous matter that had nothing to do, originally, with Chrétien, although it is here very closely interwoven with the prose rendering of his poem. I refer to (1) the interpolation, 174–177, already discussed, of Lancelot's visit to the graves of the elder Galahad and Symeu, and (2) the episode, 215–219, which introduces Bohort into the story. The question naturally arises: May not the author of this Bohort episode, to say nothing of the Bohort adventures that are related some time after the conclusion of the prose rendering of Chrétien's *Lancelot*, have been identical with the author of in prose preceded the much longer *Lancelot* in composition. Besides, if the poems of Robert de Borron had been turned into prose after the *Lancelot* was written, they would very probably have contained some signs of adaptation to that romance.

Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXIX, 75 f. (1906), thinks that the prose renderings of Robert de Borron constituted the earliest French romance in prose, because their author, he believes, had a motive in adopting the prose form, *viz.*, to accentuate the historical character of Robert's narratives, which would be wanting in the case of the other romances. But this reasoning strikes me as oversubtle. As a matter of fact, well on into the thirteenth century even authentic historical works were often written in vernacular verse.

that prose rendering? The same writer, of course, may have utilized Chrétien's *Lancelot* and then attached to it materials concerning Bohort, either of his own invention or drawn from other sources. I find, however, an indication that this is not so in the circumstance that, just as the portion of the narrative which is based on Chrétien begins immediately after the death of Galehaut, so the first thing that is mentioned (p. 226) after that portion is concluded is, likewise, the death of Galehaut. A writer who had already broken the continuity of his prose adaptation of Chrétien with the Bohort episode would have had no interest in thus indicating that he was returning to the earlier narrative at this point. On the other hand, a writer who was about to put on the stage a new hero (Bohort) would not have delayed his entrance with the long series of Lancelot adventures, represented by the prose rendering of Chrétien's *Lancelot*. The author of this first Bohort episode, 215-219, was, no doubt, the author of most of the other episodes pertaining to this character in the remainder of Vol. IV, viz., pp. 237-275, 296-303—and he thrust this initial episode into the midst of the *Charete* story in order to join the new materials to the old as firmly as possible. The episode in question is really a cheap repetition of pp. 162 ff. Lancelot, though disgraced in all men's eyes by riding in a cart, had displayed irresistible valor in Gorre, so Bohort makes his *entrée* under the same circumstances, yet unhorses the most celebrated knights of Arthur's court in succession. The adapter of Chrétien would hardly have repeated the same *motif* within the limits of so few pages.

In thus interpolating the prose rendering of Chrétien, the author of the Bohort episodes was only doing what the author of the Gawain adventures IV, 182-195, in the unique version of MS. Add. 10293, tried to do. Where the former succeeded, however, the latter failed, probably because the MS. tradition by this time was too well established.

It is to be observed that there had been no allusion to Bohort in the *Lancelot* since III, 124, when Lancelot took leave of his cousins on first going to court.¹²² Here (IV, 215) after all these inter-

¹²² His brother, Lionel, had played a certain part in the romance in the interval. For example, cf. III, 372 ff., 403 ff., IV, 101 ff., 140 ff. In the *Morf Festschrift*, p. 54, Brugger suggests that Lionel was the hero of a separate

vening adventures (521 large quarto pages), he turns up again. Now, no one, I believe, will imagine that the person who wrote the account of the childhood of the brothers, Lionel and Bohort, wrote the 521 intervening pages—or even so much of them as is left, after the exclusion of the later additions which I have suggested above—keeping in reserve all this time the character of Bohort for future exploitation. The absurdity of the idea appears from a bare statement of the case, such as I have just made. The adventures of Bohort, if not the very existence of the character, are due to later expansions of the original *Lancelot*. It is plain that Bohort's story is in many essential respects often closely imitated from Lancelot's.¹²³ I will enumerate specifically a few of the more striking features of the imitation. Like Lancelot, Bohort (1) rides in a cart (IV, 215), (2) will remain unnamed until he has given an exhibition of his quality (first named, p. 218), (3) has the Lady of the Lake as his guardian (p. 218), (4) achieves the adventure of the romance before he was brought into the prose *Lancelot*. Since the *Lancelot* undoubtedly drew from earlier metrical romances, there is nothing unlikely in the suggestion, but we have no evidence to prove it. I do not believe, however, that Bohort ever figured, except, perhaps, as a mere name, outside of the *Lancelot*. What is said of Lionel between III, 124, and IV, 215, was no doubt added later.

¹²³ P. Märtens, E. Boehmer's *Romanische Studien*, V, 646 (1880), has observed the imitation, but has missed nearly all the really salient features. He gives, however, a useful list of passages that exalt Bohort particularly.

In her *Legend of Sir Lancelot du Lac*, pp. 143 ff. (London, 1901), Miss J. L. Weston lays stress on the "evolution" (postulating, as usual, a gradual development) of the character, but this is exaggerated. In the beginning of the *Lancelot* he appears as a mere infant. It was the author of the episodes, IV, 215 ff., etc., who really created the character, and, although he figures in incidents in Sommer's Part III of the *Lancelot* that were probably later additions, he acquires no new traits, except in certain passages, which, as I shall attempt to prove, are by the author of the *Mort Artu*. The author of the *Queste* makes him conform to the ascetic ideal, in order that he might be qualified to serve as one of the trinity of champions (no other number would have sufficed) who attain the Holy Grail. The author of the Brangoire's daughter episode writes under the influence of the *Queste*, and so makes Bohort's cohabitation with that princess his one (and unintentional) carnal sin. Miss Weston imagines that different redactions of the *Lancelot*, when brought to light, will show this evolution of Bohort, but P. Paris and Sommer, who have studied the *Lancelot* MSS., know of no such redactions. P. Paris, V, 167, note, calls the incident of Brangoire's daughter one of the "remaniements successifs" of the Grail legend.

knight whose hand had been pierced by a sword (p. 260 ff., even usurping Lancelot's place as "li mioldres cheualiers del monde"), which duplicates Lancelot's adventure, III, 120 ff., (5) is the Knight of the Cleft Shield (p. 264), (6) in the affair with Brangoire's daughter is the victim of the same deception as was practised on Lancelot in his affair with Pelles's daughter (p. 270). Helain le Blanc, whom Bohort begot on this occasion, corresponds then to Galahad, and so, later, just as Bohort, V, 296, discovers Galahad, so Lancelot discovers Helain, V, 311, whose birth was unknown to Bohort. Lancelot (p. 311) remarks on the similarity of the circumstances under which the two children were begotten.

Again, considerations of style support the other kinds of evidence, in suggesting a different authorship for the Bohort adventures, which begin with the cart episode (IV, 215). Apart from the question of imitation, these adventures, to a modern taste, are unequaled for banality and insipidity by any in the whole *Lancelot*, save, perhaps, some of those that are told in connection with the great quest for Lancelot, which begins IV, 321. The last of those enumerated—the adventure with Brangoire's daughter—constitutes, in some degree, an exception—partly, no doubt, because it is modelled on an episode of remarkable interest—the one in which is narrated the conception of Galahad, V, 105 ff. Besides, as I have already observed, in all likelihood, this episode of Brangoire's daughter is by a different hand from the other adventures of Bohort in Vol. IV. Like its model, it is, of course, later than the *Queste*, whereas the greater part of the adventures of this character must be earlier, for his prominence in the *Queste* would be inexplicable, if he had not already played an important rôle in the *Lancelot*. The cross references to this incident of Bohort and Brangoire's daughter in our MSS. of the *Queste*, VI, 112, 119, are, of course, the insertions of an *assembleur* or redactor.

Inasmuch as the character of Bohort, owing to his relationship to Lancelot, must have figured in the beginning of the *Lancelot* and inasmuch as in that part he (a mere child) is named most frequently in the episode of Claudas's wars, which, as I have endeavored to show, was a later addition to the *Lancelot*, one might suppose that his adventures in IV, 215 ff., etc., were probably the production of the same pen as that episode, as it now stands in our

MSS. This supposition, however, is out of the question, owing to the difference of style. The Claudas episode of our MSS., as I have already observed, is one of the finest things in the *Lancelot*, the narrative of Bohort's adventures one of the feeblest. On the other hand, the writer who introduced into our romance the story of Bohort and his adventures—and the same, of course, applies to Lionel—must also have given an account of his parentage and childhood. His relationship to Lancelot made this imperative. Since the existing account of Bohort's childhood, as we have just seen, is not by the author who introduced him into the story, we must conclude that it has supplanted one that was by that author. The impression of greater primitiveness which this extant account produces, as compared with the Bohort adventures, is due simply to its superior strength. It makes the same impression, though, of course, in a less degree, when compared with the narrative of Lancelot's *enfances* that comes immediately after it, yet everything goes to show that of these two closely connected narratives the *enfances* was the earlier.

Excluding the Bohort episodes, IV, 215–219, 237–275, the narrative which follows upon the prose adaptation of Chrétien's *Lancelot* down to p. 296 has Lancelot as its central figure, and deals, in a large measure, with characters in that adaptation (Baudemagus and his daughter) and with Galehaut (his burial at Joyeuse Garde), the hero (next to Lancelot) of the part to which the adaptation is fitted on (*i. e.*, the so-called *Galehaut* section). I have no doubt, then, that we owe such fundamental elements of the narrative as I have just enumerated to the author of that adaptation. But the whole (in my opinion) has been recast, and, doubtless, expanded by the author of the Bohort episodes, so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to delimit the boundaries of the work of the two writers. On the theory of double authorship, the Banin episode, pp. 288 f., would be the most obvious later addition to the *Lancelot* adventures. This character, Ban's godson, belongs to the story of Claudas's dealings with the young princes at the beginning of the *Lancelot*, and, like Lambegues, Pharien's nephew, and Claudas's mortal enemy, he is re-introduced from that part of the romance by the author of the Bohort adventures. Lambegues is not mentioned between III, 118, and IV, 297—that is to say, for

709 consecutive large quarto pages. He reappears IV, 297-300, in connection with one brief adventure of Bohort, after which he vanishes altogether from the *Lancelot*.¹²⁴ Similarly, if we except the late *Merlin* continuation, the famous Sir Bedivere (Bedoier) occurs nowhere in the Vulgate cycle save in the opening episodes of the *Lancelot* and in Bohort's cart adventure, IV, 215 ff. Banin, himself, is not mentioned between III, 111, and IV, 288—that is to say, for 607 consecutive pages of Sommer's edition. He figures here in an episode, IV, 288 f., that occupies little more than a page, and is heard of no more for 218 pages, when he reappears, V, 145, in a passing allusion in the story of Bohort's first visit to Corbenic.¹²⁵ The utterly insignificant incident with which Banin is connected here, IV, 288 f. (Lancelot *incognito* stops at Banin's castle and hears his praises from the old man) is introduced merely to keep alive the characters of the opening episodes of the romance from which Bohort, the new hero, has, himself, just been resuscitated, as it were, and to unite the Bohort and Lancelot adventures, respectively, of this part of the *Lancelot* by introducing into each the characters just referred to. Saraide (damsel of the Lady of the Lake) is re-introduced at IV, 251.—If one were disposed to pursue the analysis further and endeavor to fix the elements in the Lancelot episodes which were due to the author of the Bohort adventures, Lancelot's affairs with Margondes and Melyadus, IV, 228 ff., with the Black and Red Knights, 283 ff., and with Argondras, 290 ff., would, no doubt, be next eliminated as later insertions of this author, since they are on a par with the Bohort adventures in aimless insipidity; but we have no positive data for the solution of the problem, and it is, perhaps, better to desist from an attempt which offers so little hope of success. For the same reasons one

¹²⁴ He is named once more in a MS. variant reading (printed by Sommer at the bottom of the page) at V, 324.

¹²⁵ He is mentioned, but only in the most casual manner, twice more, V, 340, 343 (in connection with Claudas's later wars) in Sommer's text, and at V, 236, 242, 324 at the bottom of the page in MS. variants. It is hardly open to doubt that the naming of Banin three times in these hundreds of pages (for it is nothing more) is due mainly to the scribes. If this is so, the passage, IV, 288 f., is the only one in the *Lancelot*, after the first 111 pages of the romance, in which he appears. In the face of such conditions, who will contend that this, too, is not, also, a late insertion?

might be inclined to assign the adventures of Bohort disguised and of Kay, Sagremor and Dodinel, which extend from p. 301 to p. 321 (where the great quest of Gawain and his companions for Lancelot begins) to the author of the previous episodes in which Bohort is undisguised. There is an indication, however, that the last set of adventures, which are particularly absurd—Lancelot, who is rescuing the Queen from the disguised Bohort, being called away to fulfill a vow which he has made to an old damsel wearing a gold circlet on her bald head, etc.—is a still later addition by another hand, for, p. 301, Lancelot, the hero of the entire romance, is introduced as if he were a new character! The whole paragraph, which begins these adventures, reads as if it opened a new story, but is too long to quote here. In substance, it tells how a year after Meleagant's death, a week after Whitsuntide, Arthur went on a big hunt in the forest of Camelot. The people who had attended his court at Whitsuntide had not yet dispersed, so that four kings and many other men of high rank participated in the hunt. Among the Queen's escort were Kay, Sagremor, Dodinel and Lancelot—"et li quars fu mesires Lancelot del Lac, li fix au roy Ban de Benoyc qui asses estoit & preus et uaillans." Like Meleagant, Bohort (who remains unrecognized and unnamed throughout the adventure) tries to carry off Guinevere, but Lancelot intervenes, and, by wounding him, prevents the execution of his attempt, although he, too, is severely wounded in the combat.

With IV, 321, begins the quest for Lancelot by Gawain and his companions which occupies so large a part of the remainder of the romance.¹²⁶ It does not end, indeed, until V, 318, and so extends through nearly a third of the whole *Lancelot*. I do not believe that originally this part of the *Lancelot* was either planned or executed on any such scale. Apart from the interpolations based on the

¹²⁶ There had been three quests for Lancelot before this in our romance, in all of which Gawain played the leading rôle, viz., III, 226-231, 271-321, continued 358-405, in which Gawain is accompanied by twenty knights (p. 273), and lastly, IV, 143-153. Baudemagus remarks, V, 98, that he had known sixty-six knights to go in quest of Lancelot and not find him. No such quest, however, is related in our MSS.

It is remarked, V, 270, that a quest should last only a year and a day, but that Gawain and his companions had already been absent on this one (i. e., the one which begins IV, 321) for three years.

Estoire and *Queste del Saint Graal*, which I have already discussed, and still others based on the *Mort Artu*, which I have still to discuss, in the course of time there were, no doubt, additions to and modifications of this quest for Lancelot, as it originally stood. There are clear indications of such changes, especially in what Sommer calls Part III (*i. e.*, his Vol. V), which, however (on Paulin Paris's initiative) has been often called the *Agravain*. Let us examine these indications:

At the beginning of the quest, IV, 321, Arthur fixed the number of questers at ten (including Gawain). They were as follows: (1) Yvain, (2) Guerrehes, (3) Gaheries, (4) Mordred, (5) Hector des Mares, (6) Agloval, (7) Li Lais Hardis, (8) Brandelis, (9) Gosenains d'Estrangot, (10) Gawain. But later Kay (331), Sagremor (332), and Dodinel (334) joined the quest, making thirteen in all. At V, 8, accordingly, thirteen is said to be the total number of questers, though twelve is the number stated, V, 28, 35, 148. Before the accession of Kay, Sagremor and Dodinel, the original band of questers had already separated (p. 328) to pursue their several ways.

It will be observed now that Kay, Sagremor and Dodinel are the three knights whose adventures in connection with Lancelot and the disguised Bohort, IV, 301 ff., as there was reason to believe, constituted additions by a new hand to the previous Bohort adventures. This same hand, no doubt, added these three characters to the original list of ten questers. Adventures, however, are actually told of only one of the three, viz., Sagremor, and then, V, 24 ff., incidentally in connection with another character (Guerrehes). But the same thing is true of Brandelis (V, 39 ff.) and Gosenain (V, 41), among the original questers. They play even more insignificant parts than Sagremor, and Li Lais Hardis, of this original list, not only has no adventures at all related of him, but is not heard of again in the cycle, except that he is included in one of those lists of names (V, 340), which the scribes were accustomed to expand at will. On the other hand, with V, 3, still another character, Agravain (Gawain's brother), appears on the scene as a fourteenth quester, although up to that point he had not been mentioned in connection with the quest for Lancelot. Sommer's Part III (Vol.

V), the so-called *Agravain*,¹²⁷ commences, as follows, with a perfectly natural reference to Agravain's previous participation in this quest: "Chi endroit dist li contes que quant Agreuains se fu partis de sez compaignons si com vous aues oi quil erra .ij. iours sans aenture trouuer que on doie ramentoir en liure," etc. This passage proves beyond dispute that the original quest for Lancelot later suffered modifications, but the confusions and inconsistencies before it which have been cited, to my mind, already supply convincing evidence to the same effect.¹²⁸

At V, 62, two more questers, not named in the original list, viz., Lionel and Bohort, join in the search for Lancelot.

¹²⁷ In spite of Brugger's assertion to the contrary, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXXVI, 206 (review section, 1910), the *Agravain* does frequently represent a separate division in the MS. tradition. See what I have said on the subject in the *ROMANTIC REVIEW*, IV, 464 (1913). What interpretation we should put upon this fact is another matter. If the *Lancelot* were divided into three volumes of approximately the same number of pages each, the third volume might very well begin with the *Agravain*, as is actually the case in Sommer's edition, and the division, then, be due to purely mechanical considerations; but the extant MSS. of the *Lancelot* do not show any such division into three volumes, or even into three parts (distinguished by blank leaves between or some such device). Taking the fact of the division and the coincident confusion as to the characters and their adventures in the quest for Lancelot at this point, I believe that the first occasion of the division being made just here was connected in some way with an attempt at a new redaction of this quest.

Sommer, IV, 362, note 2, has pointed out how the scribe of MS. Royal, 19. C. XIII, observed the unjustified entry of Agravain on the scene and tried vainly to explain it.

¹²⁸ In vol. V we find still other evidences of change in the part of the narrative which is covered by this quest: p. 21, Guerrehes's love affair with the "damoisele de la blanche lande," is referred to as well-known, though not mentioned elsewhere in the extant MSS.; p. 33, it is said of the lady whose husband Guerrehes slew and who took the veil that she was a very "sainte chose et religieuse, ensi comme li contes le deuisera cha auant en maint lieu," but, as a matter of fact, we never hear of her again; p. 35, we have a reference to Guerrehes's rescue of the damsel who cares for Agravain in prison, but this adventure is not previously told in the extant MSS. Note, also, pp. 221 f.: That we should have here within the space of a single page two excuses for not relating all the adventures of the knights of the quest seems a hint that a redactor is shortening the narrative. This seems confirmed by p. 224, where Lionel suddenly appears as Vagor's prisoner in "lille estrange" in a way which is not entirely cleared up by his subsequent story (p. 229) to Lancelot. Even stronger confirmation is afforded by p. 236, where we have a list of the knights whom Bohort had vanquished at the "tertre deruee," although there had been no account of any such combats in our MSS.

Despite these indications of modifications of the original design of the quest for Lancelot, which begins with IV, 321, it is, in my opinion, only in the case of a few passages—important ones, to be sure—that we can draw lines of demarcation with practical certainty between older and later materials. Here, as everywhere in our romances, of course, the author of such additions makes the new materials dovetail with the old, and, perhaps, scribes and redactors, by still later additions, aided in the harmonizing process. Notwithstanding, however, the difficulties for the higher criticism which this procedure creates, I believe that we may distinguish as later insertions in this part of the *Lancelot* the following: V, 59–105 (except 87–91), and part of 112–124—still further 166–188, 215–223. I will take them up in their due order.

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

(*To be continued*)

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN THE ROMANCE LANGUAGES AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY. A SURVEY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

THOUGH taking chronological precedence over the Department of Romance Languages of the Johns Hopkins University by one dissertation, the Department of Romance Languages of Harvard University only began offering well-defined courses for the doctoral degree about ten years after the former institution had established courses with that aim in view. Among the pioneers in this important work at Harvard was Professor E. S. Sheldon, who first became a member of the Department in 1877. In 1884 he was advanced to an assistant professorship of Romance philology—the first assistant professorship of this specific nature to be founded in an American university. (The first full professorship in Romance philology was that created for Professor Todd at Columbia in 1893.) Like Professor Elliott, Professor Sheldon has contributed largely toward moulding philological thought in America, and his influence has been far-reaching. His pupils in the aggregate are numerous and his thoroughly scientific methods have been introduced in many of our more important institutions. Professor Adolphe Cohn, who taught in Harvard from 1884 to 1891, was the first professor in an American university who had received all of his advanced training in France. An archiviste paléographe of the *Ecole nationale des Chartes* in 1874, he applied in his courses relating to literary criticism and history the rigorous method and fine discrimination so happily characteristic of French scholarship. Professor Cohn has been a unique figure in academic life. Thanks to his brilliant intellect, broad scholarship and indefatigable enthusiasm, the university study of literature in America was elevated to the same critical plane as that of philology (in the narrower sense). Before his influence began to make itself felt, the Ph.D. degree and philology were considered inseparable. To him probably more than to any other man is due the credit for having stemmed the tide that throughout the eighties was steadily flowing

from the Romance departments of America toward the German universities. He always sought to emphasize the broader methods and higher ideals of the institutions of learning in France. While recognizing the importance of philology, and always insisting that it should be maintained on a complete parity with its sister subject, Professor Cohn refused to yield to it precedence over literature as a graduate study, and his valiant efforts have been rewarded by the fact that the place of the study of Romance literature is now firmly fixed in the curricula of all of our important universities. Professor Ferdinand Bôcher was among the first to realize the importance of suitable texts as an essential introduction to advanced study, and sought to satisfy this growing need on the part of our students by supplying carefully wrought editions of the great French classics, thereby opening the way that was later to be followed by other scholars—even those of France. Hence his influence has been principally pedagogical. In this he was vigorously supported by Professor Cohn, for both of these scholars foresaw that it would be necessary for the American university of the future to give the student adequate elementary training, to which, so to speak, European institutions would in some important respects put the finishing touches. How well the Department of Romance Languages of Harvard University has harbored these traditions it is needless to emphasize. Suffice it to say that the standard of scholarship in this department has always been maintained on a par with the general improvement in instruction in our universities.

In 1876 the first doctorate of the Department of Romance Languages of Harvard was conferred on Lucius H. Buckingham. From 1894 on, the same degree has been granted to forty-nine men, of whom three are deceased. These include Professor Buckingham who, at the time of his death in 1885, was master of the English High School of Boston; Professor Murray Anthony Potter, assistant professor of Romance Languages at Harvard, who died in 1915 (for his obituary, see *ROMANIC REVIEW*, vi, 1915, pp. 350-1); and Professor Andrew Paul Raggio, professor of Spanish and Italian in the University of Maine, whose death occurred in December, 1917. Among the other recipients of the degree one is a college president, twelve are professors of Romance or Modern Languages,

five are associate professors, fourteen assistant professors, four instructors, one assistant professor of Greek and Fine Arts, one librarian, three high school masters, one travelling fellow, and five not actively engaged in teaching. The institutions represented number twenty-seven in all, and are as follows (the figure in parenthesis indicating the number of doctors of philosophy of the Harvard Romance Department on the faculty of each institution): Boston University (2); Bowdoin (1); Clark College (1); Columbia (2); Commercial High School, Brooklyn (1); Cornell (1); Dartmouth (1); Ethical Culture School (1); Harvard (5); Leland Stanford, Jr., University (1); Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1); Northwestern (1); Rice Institute (1); Simmons College, Boston (1); Smith College (1); University of Alberta (1); University of California (2); University of Chicago (2); University of Illinois (2); University of Michigan (1); University of North Carolina (1); University of Pennsylvania (1); University of Rochester (1); University of Toronto (1); University of Washington (2); University of Wisconsin (3); Washington University, St. Louis (1).

Of the dissertations, about one half—twenty-five, to be exact—have been published in more or less complete form. Those published complete—most of which, it may be said, appeared some years after the conferring of the degree, with subsequent changes of title and of content—are ten in number. Only portions or summarized results of the remaining fifteen have thus far been issued. The average length of the dissertations published *in toto* is 236 pages, the longest containing 624 pages and the shortest 47 pages. The average length of those published in part is 96 pages, the longest being a series of articles totalling 596 pages, and under the shortest must be classed two abstracts of 10 pages each.

In regard to the subjects treated the following general classification may suffice: Romance Philology (4); French Philology (2); Italian Philology (4); Spanish Philology (5); Spanish Syntax (2); Old French (7); French Literature (10); Italian Literature (7); and Spanish Literature (7).

It is difficult to give a satisfactory list of the publications in which the dissertations appeared, inasmuch as many were issued at

irregular intervals in the form of separate articles in various reviews. However, in order to classify them in a general way, it may be said that three were privately printed, seven appeared wholly or in part in the *Publications* of the Modern Language Association of 'America, one in *Romania*, four in the *Revue Hispanique*, one in the *Studies in Philology of the University of North Carolina*, one in the *University of Michigan Studies*, three in the *ROMANIC REVIEW*, one in the *Modern Language Review*, one in the series of the *Grimm Library*, two in the *Harvard Studies in Romance Languages*, and one in the *Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

- 1876 * Buckingham, Lucius, Henry, Ph.D.
That the Romance languages, in deriving from the Latin, followed tendencies to change, which the Latin already exhibited, is illustrated by the study of Romance verbal formations. (Unpublished.)
Master, English High School, Boston, Mass., 1881-1885.
Deceased.
- 1894 Geddes, James, Jr., Ph.D.
Study of an Acadian dialect. Revised, and published as "Study of an Acadian-French dialect spoken on the north shore of the Raiedes-Chaleurs," Halle a. S., Niemeyer, 1908, 4to, pp. xviii, 318, map.
Professor of Romance Languages, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
- 1895 McKenzie, Kenneth, Ph.D.
The development of Italian lyric poetry before the rise of the *dolce stil nuovo*. Revised in part, and published as "A sonnet ascribed to Chiaro Davanzati and its place in fable literature" in *PMLA.*, 1898, XIII, pp. 205-220.
Professor of Romance Languages, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- 1897 Ford, Jeremiah Denis Matthias, Ph.D.
The Old Spanish sibilants. Published in *Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, 1900, VII, pp. 1-182.
Professor of the French and Spanish Languages, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.

- 1897 Weeks, Raymond, Ph.D.
 Aliscans and the Nerbonesi. Results, revised, published as
 "The primitive Prise d'Orange," in *PLMA.*, 1901, XVI,
 pp. 361-374; "Etudes sur Aliscans," in *Romania*, 1901,
 XXX, pp. 184-197; 1905, XXXIV, pp. 237-277; 1909,
 XXXVIII, pp. 1-43; and "Origin of the Covenant
 Vivien," in *Univ. of Missouri Studies*, i, Columbia, Mo.,
 1902, 8vo, pp. viii, 64.
 Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures, Colum-
 bia University, New York, N. Y.
- 1899 * Potter, Murray Anthony, Ph.D.
 The epic theme of a combat between father and son: a study
 of its genesis and use in literature and popular tradition.
 Published as "Sohrab and Rustum: the epic theme," etc.,
 in the *Grimm Library*, XIV, London, 1902, 8vo, pp. xii,
 234.
 Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Harvard Uni-
 versity, 1907-1915.
 Deceased.
- 1901 Clark, John Taggart, Ph.D.
 An examination of the development of medial consonants in
 Italian, with special reference to the question of accent
 influence. Results published in part in *Romania*, 1903,
 XXXII, pp. 593-596; 1904, XXXIII, pp. 246-248; 1905,
 XXXIV, pp. 66-86.
 Assistant Professor of Romanic Philology, University of
 California, Berkeley, Cal.
- 1907 Clark, Thatcher, Ph.D.
 Long unaccented final *e*, in Latin, does not phonetically be-
 come *i*, in Italian. (Unpublished.)
 Head of the French Department, Ethical Culture School,
 New York, N. Y.
- 1902 Comfort, William Wistar, Ph.D.
 The development of the character types in the French chan-
 sons de geste, *PMLA.*, 1906, XXI, pp. 279-434.
 President, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
- 1902 Morley, Sylvanus Griswold, Ph.D.

- Spanish influence on Molière. Portions published in *PMLA.*, 1904, XIX, pp. 270-290.
 Assistant Professor of Spanish, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
- 1902 Rice, Carl Cosmo, Ph.D.
 The phonology of Gallic clerical Latin after the sixth century: an introductory historical study based chiefly on Merovingian and Carolingian spelling and on the forms of Old French loan-words. Published by the author, Moscow, Idaho, 1909, 8vo, pp. 120. (Abstract pub. in *Proc. Amer. Philol. Assoc.*, 1904, XXXV, pp. lxiv, lxv.)
 Congressional Library, Washington, D. C.
- 1904 Chenery, Winthrop Holt, Ph.D.
 Object pronouns in dependent clauses: a study in Old Spanish word order. Published, with omissions, in *PMLA.*, 1905, XX, pp. 1-151.
 Associate Professor of Spanish and Romanic Philology, and Librarian, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
- 1904 Kerr, William Alexander Robb, Ph.D.
 Platonic love theories in the Renaissance, with special regard to France. Results published in part as "Le cercle d'amour," in *PMLA.*, 1904, XIX, pp. 33-63; "Antoine Héroet's 'Parfaite Amye,'" *ibid.*, 1905, XX, pp. 567-583; and "The Pléiade and Platonism," in *Modern Phil.*, 1908, V, pp. 407-421.
 Professor of Modern Languages, and Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
- 1904 * Raggio, Andrew Paul, Ph.D.
 A treatment of the development from popular Latin to Spanish of certain consonant groups ending in y. (Unpublished.)
 Professor of Spanish and Italian, University of Maine, Orono, Me.
 Deceased.
- 1904 Salvio, Alphonso de, Ph.D.
 The verse endings and the rhyme in the *Divina Commedia*. (Unpublished.)

Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

1905 Reed, Frank Otis, Ph.D.

The history of the Spanish past participle compounded with *haber*. (Unpublished.)

Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

1905 Umphrey, George Wallace, Ph.D.

A study of the Aragonese dialect, based on a fourteenth century manuscript now edited for the first time. Published in two parts, as "Aragonese texts," in the *Revue Hispanique*, 1907, XVI, pp. 244-287; and "The Aragonese dialect," *ibid.*, 1911, XXIV, pp. 5-45.

Associate Professor of Spanish, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

1905 Underwood, Charles Marshall, Jr., Ph.D.

The *ars poetica* of the sweet new style: a study of the second book of Dante's treatise *De Vulgari Eloquentia* and of its relation to certain early Italian canzoni. (Unpublished.)

Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Simmons College, Boston, Mass.

1906 Brown, Frederic Willis, Ph.D.

An historical study of the preterite tense in Italian. (Unpublished.)

Professor of Modern Languages, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.

— 1906 Coester, Alfred Lester, Ph.D.

Compression in the *Poema del Cid*. Published in part in the *Revue Hispanique*, 1906, XV, pp. 98-211.

Teacher of Spanish, Evander Childs High School, New York, N. Y.

1906 Dey, William Morton, Ph.D.

The history of the prefix *por-* in Old French. Published, somewhat rearranged, as "The Latin prefix *pro-* in French," in *Studies in Philology*, University of North Carolina, 1915, XII, pp. 135-182.

Professor of the Romance Languages and Literatures, Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

- 1906 Gill, John Glanville, Ph.D.
 Agglutination as a process of word formation in French.
 (Unpublished.)
 Professor of Romance Languages, Trinity College, 1909-
 1912.
 2375 Cherokee Parkway, Louisville, Ky.
- 1906 Moore, Clarence King, Ph.D.
 An historical study of the Spanish preposition *á* with the
 accusative case. (Unpublished.)
 Professor of Romance Languages, University of Rochester,
 Rochester, N. Y.
- 1906 Vaughan, Herbert Hunter, Ph.D.
 The language of Il Fiore. (Unpublished.)
 Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, University of
 Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
- 1906 Zdanowicz, Casimir Douglass, Ph.D.
 Greek proper names in Old French. (Unpublished.)
 Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, University of
 Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
- 1907 Adams, Edward Larrabee, Ph.D.
 The formation of nouns and adjectives in Provençal by the
 addition of suffixes. Published as "Word formaton in
 Provençal" in *University of Michigan Studies, Human-
 istic Series*, II, New York, 1913, pp. xvii, 607.
 Assistant Professor of French and Spanish, University of
 Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- 1908 Cerf, Barry H., Ph.D.
 A classification of the manuscripts of Ogier le Danois. Pub-
 lished, condensed, in *PLMA.*, 1908, XXIII, pp. 545-555.
 Associate Professor of Romance Languages, University of
 Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
- 1908 Churchman, Philip Hudson, Ph.D.
 Byron and the Spanish peninsula. Portions published as
 "Espronceda's Blanca de Borbon," in the *Revue His-
 panique*, 1907, XVII, pp. 549-777, pl. 3-6; "Lord Byron's
 experiences in the Spanish peninsula in 1809," in the
Bulletin Hispanique, 1909, XI, pp. 55-95, 125-171; "By-

ron and Espronceda," in the *Revue Hispanique*, 1909, XX, pp. 5-210; and "The beginnings of Byronism in Spain," *ibid.*, 1910, XXIII, pp. 333-410.

Professor of Romance Languages, Clark College, Worcester, Mass.

- 1908 Hawkins, Richmond Laurin, Ph.D.

The life and works of Maistre Charles Fontaine, Parisien, in *Harvard Studies in Romance Languages*, II, Cambridge, 1916, 8vo, pp. vi, 288.

Instructor in French, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

- 1908 Whittem, Arthur Fisher, Ph.D.

The sources of the fables in Juan Ruiz's *Libro de Buen Amor*. (Unpublished.)

Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

- 1909 Langley, Ernest Felix, Ph.D.

The poetry of Giacomo da Lentino (Sicilian school); critical edition, in *Harvard Studies in Romance Languages*, I, Cambridge, 1915, 8vo, pp. xli, 150.

Professor of French, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.

- 1909 Post, Chandler Rathfon, Ph.D.

Castilian allegory of the fifteenth century, with especial reference to the influence of Dante. Published as "Mediaeval Spanish allegory," in *Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*, IV, Cambridge, 1915, pp. xii, 331.

Assistant Professor of Greek and of Fine Arts, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

- 1909 Spiers, Alexander Guy Holborn, Ph.D.

The character and effectiveness of final lines in Dante's lyric. (Unpublished.)

Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

- 1910 Wilkins, Ernest Hatch, Ph.D.

The chronology of the youth of Boccaccio. Two chapters published as "The date of the birth of Boccaccio," in the *ROMANIC REVIEW*, 1910, I, pp. 367-373; and "The

- enamorment of Boccaccio," in *Modern Philology*, 1913, XI, pp. 39-55.
 Professor of Romance Languages, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- 1911 Keniston, Ralph Hayward, Ph.D.
 Garcilaso de la Vega: a critical edition of his works, together with a life of the poet. (Unpublished.)
 Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
- 1912 Goldberg, Isaac, Ph.D.
 Don José Echegaray: a study in modern Spanish drama. (Unpublished.)
 189 Townsend St., Roxbury, Mass.
- 1912 Waxman, Samuel Montefiore, Ph.D.
 Chapters on magic in Spanish literature. Published in the *Revue Hispanique*, 1916, XXXVIII, pp. 325-463.
 Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
- 1913 Moore, Olin Harris, Ph.D.
 The Young King: Henry Plantagenet (1155-1183) in literature and tradition. Portions published in the *ROMANIC REVIEW*, 1913, IV, pp. 1-26; 1914, V, pp. 45-54.
 Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- 1913 Pellissier, Robert Edouard, Ph.D.
 The neo-classic movement in Spain during the eighteenth century. (Unpublished.)
 Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal.
- 1913 Woodbridge, Benjamin Mather, Ph.D.
 La vie les oeuvres de Gatien de Courtilz, Sieur du Verger. Résumé of part published as "Gatien de Courtilz, Sieur du Verger, a precursor of Lesage," in *Modern Language Review*, 1914, IX, pp. 475-492.
 Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Rice Institute, Houston, Tex.

- 1914 Altrocchi, Rudolph, Ph.D.
Two Old Italian versions of the legend of Saint Alexius. A part published in the *ROMANIC REVIEW*, 1915, VI, pp. 353-363.
Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- 1914 Redfield, John Howard, Ph.D.
The earliest Latin-Romance loan words in Basque and their bearing on the history of Basque and the neighboring Romance languages. (Unpublished.)
211 Upland Way, Wayne, Pa.
- 1914 Underwood, George Arthur, Ph.D.
Rousseauism in the works of Madame de Staël. (Unpublished.)
Instructor in French, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
- 1915 Bruerton, Courtney, Ph.D.
Chapters in the history of the *comédie-vaudeville*, from its origins to the present time. (Unpublished.)
Instructor in French, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
- 1916 Atkin, Ernest George, Ph.D.
Villemain and the historical method. (Unpublished.)
Associate Professor of Romance Languages, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
- 1916 Clark, Alexander Frederick Bruce, Ph.D.
Boileau in England, with some notes on the influence of the other French critics, 1660-1800. (Unpublished.)
Lecturer in English, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- 1916 Happel, Albert Philip, Ph.D.
The life and works of the Abbé de Saint-Réal. (Unpublished.)
Instructor in Romance Languages, Asheville School, Asheville, N. C.
- 1916 Shapiro, Albert Abraham, Ph.D.
The Libertins in France in the seventeenth century. (Unpublished.)

Frederick Sheldon Travelling Fellow, Harvard University,
Santiago, Chile.

1917 Arvin, Neil Cole, Ph.D.

The *Comédies-Vaudevilles* of Eugène Scribe. (Unpub-
lished.)

1917 Leavitt, Sturgis Elbeno, Ph.D.

Scarron in England, 1656-1800. (Unpublished.)

JOHN L. GERIG

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

MISCELLANEOUS

RABELAIS AND THE WAR OF 1914

READERS of Rabelais will recall the chapters dealing with the Picrocholian war. Perhaps only those who have turned the pages of Rabelais again during these recent months have noticed how very closely, not merely in general spirit but even in some of its details, the narrative parallels events of the last few years in our own time. The comparison should have its interest for us of the present.

It will be remembered that Picrochole, the type of the unscrupulous king,¹ has invoked a pretext to attack the kingdom of his neighbor, Grandgousier. Picrochole's counselors have led him to believe that he can very soon conquer the whole world. They advise him in these terms: "Vostre armée partirez en deux, comme trop mieulx l'entendez. L'une partie ira ruer sur ce Grandgousier et ses gens. Par icelle sera de prime abordée facilement desconfit. Là recouvrerez argent à tas."² This plan was to be completed by invasions of Spain, Africa, Italy, Palestine, Austria, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the British Isles, and many other countries, including even Greenland "jusques à la mer Glaciale."³

Of those present only one attempts to prick this bubble and to show that, successful or not, the plan is utterly foolish. This is Echephron, an old gentleman of much experience and sound judgment, who inquires:

"Que pretendez vous par ces belles conquestes? Quelle sera la fin de tant de travaux et traverses?"

"—Ce sera (dist Picrochole) que, nous retournerons, repouserons à noz aises."

¹ M. Abel Lefranc identifies Picrochole with Gaucher de Sainte-Marthe, known for the violence and combativeness of his character. The Rabelais family and others struggled for years to compel him to answer in court for his infringements upon their rights. Cf. Rabelais, *Œuvres* (Lefranc ed., 1913, *Introd.*, pp. lx ff.).

² *Id.*, *Gargantua*, vol. II, Chap. XXXIII, p. 292.

³ *Id.*, p. 299.

Dont dist Echephron: "Et, si par cas jamais n'en retournez, car le voyage est long et pereilleux, n'est ce mieulx que des maintenant nous repousons, sans nous mettre en ces hazars?"⁴

But this "Norman Angell" argument has of course no effect upon Picrochole. The invasion of Grandgousier's territories continues. The latter writes to his son, Gargantua, to return from Paris to assist in the defense of the kingdom. The letter explains the situation in terms not dissimilar to those since used by President Wilson. Says Grandgousier:

"Ma deliberation n'est de provocquer, ains de apaiser; d'assaillir, mais defendre; de conquerer, mais de garder mes feaulx subjectz et terres hereditaires, es quelles est hostilement entré Picrochole sans cause ny occasion, et de jour en jour poursuit sa furieuse entreprinse avecques excès non tolerables à personnes libres."⁵

Grandgousier, still hoping against hope to be able to preserve peace, sends an ambassador to Picrochole with this message:

"Doncques merveille n'est si le roy Grandgousier, mon maistre, est à ta furieuse et hostile venue saisy de grand desplaisir et perturbé en son entendement. Merveille seroit si ne l'avoient esmeu les excès incomparables qui en ses terres et subjectz ont esté par toy et tes gens commis, es quelz n'a esté obmis exemple aucun d'in-humanité, ce que luy est tant grief de soy, par la cordiale affection de laquelle tousjours a chery ses subjectz. . . . Toutesfoys sus l'estimation humaine plus grief luy est en tant que par toy et les tiens ont esté ces griefz et tords faictz, qui de toute memoire et ancienneté aviez, toy et tes peres, une amitié avecques luy et tous ses encestres conceu, laquelle jusques à present comme sacrée ensemble aviez inviolablement maintenue, guardée et entretenue."⁶

But, though the messenger makes it clear that peace is sought, yet he firmly upholds his master's rightful dignity and the justice of his cause:

"Depars d'icy presentement, et demain pour tout le jour soye retiré en tes terres, sans par le chemin faire aucun tumulte ne force; et paye mille bezans d'or pour les dommaiges que as faict en ces terres."⁷

⁴ *Id.*, p. 300.

⁵ *Id.*, Chap. XXIX, p. 275.

⁶ *Id.*, Chap. XXXI, pp. 280-81.

⁷ *Id.*, p. 284.

All useless. Picrochole remains insolent. The ambassador returns to Grandgousier,

“lequel trouva à genous, teste nue, encliné en un petit coing de son cabinet, priant Dieu qu’il vouzist amollir la cholere de Picrochole et le mettre au point de raison, sans y proceder par force.”⁸

Grandgousier learns that Picrochole has invoked the supposed theft of some cakes as the pretext for his attacks: “Je le veulx (dist Grandgousier) bien entendre davant qu’aulture chose deliberer sur ce que seroit de faire.” He discovers that nothing is due Picrochole, since “le tout avoit esté bien payé,” and since the first provocation had come from one of Picrochole’s men, Marquet. Nevertheless, Grandgousier in such a matter is willing to go more than his half of the way, if by so doing he may spare his subjects the suffering of war. “Puis qu’il n’est question que de quelques fouaces, je essayeray le contenter, car il me desplaist par trop de lever guerre.”⁹ Picrochole, however, characteristically, interprets as evidence of weakness and fear all the efforts made to preserve peace. He merely seizes the money and cakes sent by Grandgousier in payment of the alleged damage and continues his plundering and ravaging. The ambassadors return to Grandgousier with the same conclusion as that expressed by President Wilson in his address at Baltimore: “Il n’estoit aulcun espoir de les tirer à paix, sinon à vive et forte guerre.”¹⁰

Picrochole is defeated in the war and flees. Gargantua magnanimously pardons all his enemies except (significantly) those directly responsible for the war, the evil counselors who had urged and flattered Picrochole into the undertaking of it. Of these men he feels it necessary to make an example. Thus an idealist and a thinker may be stern on occasion, as well as another. The kingdom is held in trust for the infant son of Picrochole. Especial care is taken that the boy have good teachers. In his famous speech to the vanquished, Gargantua makes it clear that he does not for a moment think of adding the new kingdom to the other dominions belonging to his father: “Car . . . sans mon vouloir, sans espoir

⁸ *Id.*, Chap. XXXII, p. 286.

⁹ *Id.*, p. 287.

¹⁰ *Id.*, p. 290.

de accroistre ny mon bien ny mon nom, estoit faicte cette guerre."¹¹
Thus he again anticipates Mr. Wilson.

Grandgousier's attitude is the same. We like to flatter ourselves by calling his words "modern" in spirit. He says: "Le temps n'est plus d'ainsi conquister les royaumes avecques dommaige de son prochain frere christian. Ceste imitation des anciens Hercules, Alexandres, Hannibalz, Scipions, Cesars et aultres telz, est contraire à la profession de l'Evangile, par lequel nous est commandé garder, saulver, regir et administrer chascun ses pays et terres, non hostilement envahir les aultres, et, ce que les Sarazins et Barbares jadis appelloient prouesses, maintenant nous appellons briganderies et mechansetez."¹²

Thus in the year 1534¹³ does Rabelais frankly declare war to be an evil, to be undertaken only in self-defense after all other means of keeping the peace have been tried and found unavailing; finally, when peace is concluded, it must be on terms of justice tempered with reasonable clemency, which does not in any way exclude the necessary punishment of those most guilty of beginning the war. Provision must be made so that they may not a second time have the opportunity to break the peace. All attempts at conquest must be abandoned as wholly contrary to the teachings of Christianity.

This brief account of Rabelais' enlightened views on the question which the world is at length, after four centuries, struggling manfully to solve in the same way, should not give the impression that Rabelais was alone during his century in dreaming this dream of peace.¹⁴ Moreover, before him were of course the doctrines of Christianity, the Greek philosophers, some of the finest passages of the great vision-seers of the Old Testament. But each man is the inheritor of the ideas of those before him and of the great men of his time with whom he is thrown in contact. Some make the most of their heritage, some do not. Entirely aside from

¹¹ *Id.*, Chap. I, pp. 392-93.

¹² *Id.*, Chap. XLVI, p. 371.

¹³ The date of *Gargantua* has been commonly given as 1535, but M. Lefranc thinks the second half of the year 1534 more probable as the date of publication (Rabelais, *Œuvres*, *Introd.*, p. xvii).

¹⁴ Cf. Lefranc, *op. cit.*, p. lxxxiii, for mention of Erasmus and Budé (among others), whose ideas were similar.

any attempt to determine specific debts to others, we are interested in Rabelais' contribution for its own sake. It is worth while to remember that it is his thought—though not his alone—that our age has adopted for itself. If a more complete recognition of the long period of time which in the past has elapsed between the promulgation of great thoughts and their fulfilment should strengthen our resolve not to let them longer remain merely dreams, then it will not be useless for us, whenever possible, to remind ourselves of those who have already blazed the trail. Especially is this the case with Rabelais, who presents us with so striking a parallel to the situation of our own time.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE TENTH TALE OF THE HEPTAMERON

*Quand Virgile en marbre était roi
Dans tes villas gallo-romaines.*

Fernand Gregh

THE tenth of the *Nouvelles* of Marguerite de Navarre relates the loves of Floride and Amadour:

Floride, après le décès de son mary, et avoir vertueusement résisté à Amadour, qui l'avoit pressé de son honneur jusques au bout, s'en ala rendre religieuse au monastere de Jesus.

It is one of the most gracious of the tales, in which we seem to recognize peculiarly the delicate range of Marguerite's understanding, her indulgence and her sense of both reality and religion. Is it autobiographical? Have the personages historical originals? The questions were sure to be asked. Leroux de Lincy did whatever conjecture could accomplish in the immediate historical background towards identification, and in the edition of P. S. Jacob (p. 61) these conjectures are duly sifted—to no very satisfactory end. Louise of Savoy as possible prototype for the heroine, the experiences of Marguerite herself with Admiral Bonnivet, the Spanish wars of Francis I, may or may not have primed the writer's imagination. It is significant that, as in *La Princesse de Clèves*, the incidents are thrown back nearly a generation, which

would seem to suggest unlikelihood that any precise identifications were intended. This is distinctly not a *roman à clef*: Marguerite was too much both a scholar and an artist to have used that dubious genre. The pastiche is a different matter: the temptation to do something like a Christian modernization of the more romantic episodes of Virgil, to produce an elegy in the mood of Ovid, is distinctly more perceptible. The young widow is not the Italian Renaissance heroine: her charm is half, at least, moral. She is a kinswoman of Beatrice even more than of Laura:

Ne vous esmerveillez point si j'ay perdu la parole devant Madame Floride, says her lover; car les vertus et la saige parolle qui sont cachez sous ceste grande jeunesse m'ont tellement estonné que je ne luy ay sceu que dire. Mais je vous prie, Avanturade, comme celle qui scavez ses secrets, me dire s'il est possible que en ceste court elle n'ayt tous les cueurs des gentils hommes; car ceulx qui la congnoistront et ne l'aymeront sont pierres ou bestes.

This Floride, after her lover's death in warfare with the Moors, apres qu'elle eut fait ses obseques honorablement, sans en parler a mere ny a belle mere, s'en ala rendre religieuse au monastere . . . prenant pour mary et amy celuy qui l'avoit delivré d'un amour si vehemente que celle d'Amadour et de l'enuy si grand que de la compaignie d'un tel mary. Ainsi tourna toutes ses affections a aymer Dieu si parfaitement qu'après avoir vescu longuement religieuse, luy rendit son ame en telle joye que l'epouse a d'aller veoir son epoux."

This is, in brief, the evolution of the story. It is the same essentially as that of Christine de Pisan's *Livre du duc des vrais amants*, and of the *Princesse de Clèves* of Madame de la Fayette, the dainty and the distinguished fiction of two women writers of the fifteenth and of the seventeenth century respectively. The tenth tale is curiously a link between these other two in the French classical tradition. Behind all three is the same sober knowledge of both Latin literature and French court life, as well as more or less of personal unhappiness. An extremely cultivated and appreciative public was also equally at the disposition of the three charming ladies. Shall we look for conclusive data as to direct and conscious borrowings or imitation? If they exist we should hardly find them, here and now.

More profitable might be an examination of the taste and the morality that give a special accent to these three stories. They are not didactic: they relate, rather, certain psychological facts. These things happened: women are like that in Christian-Stoic France. These are universals presented by artists. Such would seem to be the common mood of their authors in the three great Classic centuries of French letters. In Descartes' *Les Passions de l'Ame* (Art. XLV) this mood is set forth—also as “constatation”:

Nos passions ne peuvent pas aussi directement être excitées ni ôtées par l'action de notre volonté, mais elles peuvent l'être indirectement par la représentation des choses qui ont coutume d'être jointes avec les passions que nous voulons avoir, et qui sont contraires à celles que nous voulons rejeter. Ainsi, pour exciter en soi la hardiesse et ôter la peur, il ne suffit pas d'en avoir la volonté, mais il faut s'appliquer à considérer les raisons, les objets ou les exemples qui persuadent que le péril n'est pas grand: qu'il y a toujours plus de sûreté en la défense qu'en la fuite; qu'on aura de la gloire et de la joie d'avoir vaincu, au lieu qu'on ne peut attendre que du regret et de la honte d'avoir fui, et choses semblables.

An extreme justness and frankness of moral perception—which is more than moral naturalism, however, in that it adds the peculiar tenderness of all the greater Stoicism,—becomes *sobrece* by the action of grace. The literary quality is more interesting than the story told, or, rather, the literary quality seems to be symbolized, dramatized, as it were, by the narrative. In an unusual sense we have prose poetry. Nothing is more French: the Latin hexameter has simply thinned into the fine French phrase.

MAUD ELIZABETH TEMPLE

MT. HOLYOKE COLLEGE

A NOTE CONCERNING THE "VACANT STAKE" IN IRISH FOLKLORE.

IN a collection of Irish folk-tales written down by me from the dictation of one Patsey Nowlan, an octogenarian illiterate native speaker from County Mayo, occurs the theme of the Vacant Stake (cf. *ROM. REV.*, IX., 21) in the following form:

A young Prince starts on his journey, intent on marrying the most beautiful princess in the world. On his way he reaches at night a house where a wake is being held. An old woman is lying dead on a wretched bed, while three men stand around her, pouring the hot grease of their tapers over her body. These are her disappointed creditors, taking their revenge for the loss of the money she owed them. The prince pays the unfortunate woman's debts and has her buried decently. In requital for this act of kindness her brother instructs the prince how to win the most beautiful princess in the world. The "labor" imposed on the young suitor by the princess's father is to cleanse before sunset a stable neglected for seven years, failing in which the head of the prince is to be impaled on a stake.

In Patsey's wholesome Irish speech:

Bhí cúig spíce déag as dá fhichead as cúig céad timcheall an tighe agus bhí cloigeann shuas ar gach spíce ach aon spíce amháin.
(There were five hundred and fifty-five spikes around the house and a head on every one of them but one.)

The young man succeeds in accomplishing his task and wins the beautiful princess.

A similar story, from Ulster, will be found in E. C. Quiggin's *A Dialect of Donegal*, Cambridge, 1906, p. 201. See also Finck's *Die araner Mundart*, Marburg (1899), ii, 255.

JOSEPH DE PEROTT

WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS

REVIEWS

French Literary Studies, by T. B. Rudmose-Brown, M.A., D.Litt., Professor of Romance Languages in the University of Dublin, Late Lecturer in Romanic Philology, University of Leeds. Dublin: The Talbott Press. London: T. Fisher Unwin. New York: John Lane, 8vo, 129 pp.

A book entitled "French Literary Studies," coming from the professor of Romance languages in Trinity College, Dublin, gives rise to many expectations. The table of contents promises a veritable treat, for there is mention of subjects drawn from every period of French literature onward from the Renaissance, except the seventeenth century which is singularly ignored.

Mr. Rudmose-Brown begins his studies with Maurice Scève and the Lyonese school (which happily brings the book within the scope of the ROMANIC REVIEW) and concludes them with two poets of our own day, Stuart Merrill and Francis Vielé-Griffin. His volume comprises essays on Ronsard, on the poets of the eighteenth century, on Leconte de Lisle, on Paul Verlaine. It opens with an introductory essay which gives the author's point of view on the somewhat outworn subject of the poet's mission, and embraces also a survey of French literature from the middle ages to the present day, judged on the one hand by the criterion of the personal note, on the other by that of freedom from didactic purpose.

The chapters on Stuart Merrill and Vielé-Griffin, the two French-American poets, may be named at once as best fulfilling the promise of the book. The author, drawing upon his personal advantage in possessing Merrill's friendship and Vielé-Griffin's acquaintance, can bring first-hand knowledge to the task of estimating genius, and, indeed, in Merrill's case, the very words of the poet preserved in private letters. Merrill's apologia for the Symbolists, drawn from that source, explains in terms to satisfy the enquirer, their reaction from the attitude of *decadence*—an attitude, not a perversion, as Professor Rudmose-Brown rightly implies. "The first work of the Symbolists," wrote Merrill, "consisted in disengaging themselves from Naturalism. Their reaction was perhaps excessive in the direction of a dreamy mysticism, but it was necessary, and our return to the essential realities of life was the logical conclusion of our first principles. We loved Truth too much not to hate Reality, when it seemed opposed to Truth. We retired from the world and sought Truth, and some of us think we have found it in Nature, others in the great anonymous crowd crying for Justice."¹

Another letter gives the clue to Merrill's social and political views; his regret at the mere disappearance of the picturesque, his impatience with "a minority filling their money-bags and a majority stupefied by work and drink and voting like sheep for the Socialistic ticket instead of giving what is left in their veins of good red blood for the violent betterment of their condition."² If Merrill's

¹ *French Literary Studies*, pp. 98 and 99.

² *Ibid.*, p. 102.

convictions were those of a revolutionist, his prejudices were on the side of the aristocrat. "Of course," he continues further on in the letter, "our chief aid in our work of destruction and renovation will be the vulgar, base, stupid mob. But can't you write a sublime poem on a scrap of filthy paper? Are we not ourselves born in blood and uncleanness? No, let us not be too dainty. . . ."³ There comes to mind a similar exclamation uttered two centuries earlier by another aristocratic mind of very different bent, also persuaded of human equality, the Mère Angélique's "Are we not all one vile flesh?" Mr. Rudmose-Brown judiciously helps the self-revelation of this letter by happy arrangement, and comment so unrestrained that the reader hardly knows whether or not he receives directly, or is being persuaded to, an apprehension of the poet's stout and courageous trust in the future. "The remedies for ugliness," Merrill writes, "as for all evil, are to be sought in the future and not in the past. . . . And it is in this eternal course and movement of things that I find, strange to say, motives for courage and hope. Regret, remorse, love of the past, are the forerunners of mental decay and death. Let us always strive for the mere love of strife. The world is all wrong to-day. It will be better to-morrow, and probably even worse than now the day after to-morrow. But we have eternity before us."⁴ In like manner Professor Rudmose-Brown offers us Stuart Merrill's own words on the conduct of life, words of touching simplicity, of almost matter-of-fact rightness. Commenting on his lines:

" Pour avoir voulu, ô mon âme affolée,
Monter vers Dieu par l'arc-en-ciel,
Tu pleures au fond de la vallée. . . ."

he writes, "I mean . . . that dreams avail nothing, that we can only advance step by step, that drudgery, trivial cares and little duties are on the way of spiritual regeneration."⁵

It must be admitted that Professor Rudmose-Brown does not help his public to any critical appreciation of his friend's work. Some description of Merrill's early *decadent* work and an analysis of the great poem *Le Vagabond* is his whole contribution in this regard. The rest of the essay consists of a rather vague account of the *decadent* attitude in general, a snatch of biography, a glance at the author's own intercourse with his friend, an estimate of the latter's convictions in religion and politics. "He died as he had lived," we are told, "a Poet and in opinion (if the opinions of a Poet matter) a Revolutionary Socialist. He had no traffic with place or power: no ambitions." To this the writer adds a cryptic remark: "And when the Wild Asses of the Devil broke loose, he gave no cry of encouragement."⁶ One could wish to understand this intriguing allusion; the reference, however, is obviously political rather than literary.

Unlike Merrill, Vielé-Griffin has given the author no first-hand message to deliver, and yet this poet is more revealingly dealt with. Here Professor Rudmose-Brown brings to his interpretation an enthusiastic appreciation and warm imagination which enables him to perform for Vielé-Griffin a critic's kindest

³ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

office—to read into his work—or to bring out of it!—its dormant meaning, to entice and to prepare the unsophisticated reader to enjoy the poems from the first because he enters upon their perusal provided with a clue. The critic shows us Vielé-Griffin as, above all, the poet of life and of its warm pursuit, “abhorring all that is opposed to life in its fulness,⁷ for he who would live, who would be fully himself . . . must lay down all old and disused ideals and outworn desires for ever—times without number.”⁸ He points out how the same conception underlies such poems as *La Chevauchée d’Yeldis*, *Au Tombeau d’Hélène*, *Phocas le jardinier*, *La Légende ailée de Wieland le forgeron*, and the poems of Saint Julia and Saint Dominantia of Braga in the *Amour sacré*, and the conception is that of the fulness of life leading ever towards a distant, yet actual, blessed goal. “But the fire that burns in his (the poet’s) soul is the white fire of the spirit, not the red fire of youth aglow with the passionate acceptance of the blazing South.”⁹

This interpretation of the poet’s attitude was revealed to the author by Georges Dumesnil of the University of Grenoble, to which seat of learning Professor Rudmose-Brown pays his compliments in passing, with a lack of discrimination which is characteristic. Professor Dumesnil is “a Conservative of the best tradition, . . . amidst a Radical and unbelieving Faculty, *the one man*¹⁰ of real understanding and of unflinching conviction and nobility.”¹¹ Such sweeping judgments—and the book furnishes many examples of them—would produce less disappointment if they were offset by precise and concrete criticism, but lack of this is the particular defect of Professor Rudmose-Brown’s book. Too literally convinced, it may be, that “the letter killeth but the spirit maketh alive,” the author is vague and general in criticism even where precise analysis is indicated. His habit is, in fact, to tell his reader nothing of a poet’s power or method, rather to dwell almost altogether upon his attitude. There is no attempt, for example, to appreciate Merrill’s remarkable gift of concrete imagery, his power of sustained poetic flight, the sure harmonious touch of one of the great poets of our time. In the case of Vielé-Griffin the meditative gift, the expressive energy are equally neglected. What Professor Rudmose-Brown has to say about the general content of Vielé-Griffin’s work, is his nearest approach to definiteness: “The poems of Vielé-Griffin are full of sunlight and the scent of flowers, brimming with the joyous life of France, his mother, overflowing with all the loveliness of her smiling countrysides. The flowers, the burning noons and nights of France, white roads and forests and sleeping hamlets and mistletoe in the apple-trees. . . .”¹² It is not then a matter of surprise that the singing robes of the two poets, their actual technique, should draw from him practically no comment. The sonorous rhythms of Merrill, the new harmonics of Vielé-Griffin (upon which Remy de Gourmont so happily comments) move him not; on these things he has no opinion to express. Nor does he make any attempt to measure the value of either poet’s contribution to French literature or to estimate the place of either upon the French Parnassus.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

¹⁰ The italics are mine.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

American readers, to whom for the most part the works of both Merrill and Vielé-Griffin are too little known, should indeed, although these poets are reckoned as French, claim for them a place upon our own Parnassus. Brunetière's bitter words—so little justified in fact—give an excuse for our doing so, if one were needed:

"Ils (les Symbolistes) veulent aussi réformer la langue et, il faut l'avouer—je le répète encore si je l'ai déjà dit—c'est une prétention qui peut paraître étrange quand on voit qu'ils se nomment Stuart Merrill et Maurice Maeterlinck, Jean Moréas et Jean Psichari. Nous ne songeons point en France à réformer le flamand ni le grec."¹³

What of Merrill and of Vielé-Griffin belongs not altogether to France is ours, and the body of American literature gains weight and value indeed from that addition.

Next in interest to these two chapters, but of more immediate appeal to the readers of this REVIEW, is that on Maurice Scève and the poetic school of Lyons. At least for popular exposition, the subject is fresh, and a new word, or a well-weighed word, always has its place. Mr. Rudmose-Brown counts Scève justly enough, the "Morning Star of the Renaissance," though as a fact he was one of a galaxy—and that the brightest and most splendid. "The amethystine wine of Sunrise," Mr. Rudmose-Brown adds, "fills his goblet; he has the grave purity of the dawn just breaking, not the riotous splendour of sunset."¹⁴ He places his poet well in his setting, giving a brief account of the early Renaissance and of Scève's rank in it. But, eminent as that rank was, the biographer's enthusiasm assuredly carries him away. "Here and there," he says (after referring to "the illimitable night of his—the poet's—obscurity," a phrase he owes to Brunetière), "he succeeded in putting into words of inconceivable fulness and glory the striving of his incomparable soul."¹⁵ Praise of this sort seems, to say the least, excessive: the fulness and glory of Scève's words were assuredly matched in that century by the fulness and glory, say, of Rabelais' words or of Du Bellay's, not to mention Ronsard's. "He, of all poets who ever wrote, respected his art."¹⁶ Confronted by such a dictum as that, one is tempted to mention Homer and Virgil; but it would suffice to call to mind almost any poet of the Renaissance, that period so deferential to all art, but above all to the high art of poetry. Again, Scève is named as "the most passionate lover of all time."¹⁷ This is to forget much and many things—the names of Solomon, Sappho, Shakespeare and Petrarch among them. Professor Rudmose-Brown even speaks of Scève as being in 1562, "the most famous poet of his day."¹⁸ Such a judgment were open to question even for 1544, the year of the publication of the *Délie* sequence; but it is something worse than questionable to place such an estimate upon a poet esteemed by competent critics as "étrange, inégal, obscur"; of whose verses a contemporary could say, "Bref, ils requièrent un

¹³ *Essais sur la littérature contemporaine*. Paris, Calmann-Lévy (1892), p. 149.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

¹⁵ P. 25.

¹⁶ P. 26.

¹⁷ P. 29.

¹⁸ P. 27.

docteur";¹⁹ and that at a time when Ronsard's *Œuvres* had been published two years, when nine had passed since the *Quatre premiers livres des Odes* and the *Amours* had gone into a second edition, and when Du Bellay's *Regrets* and his *Olive* had been before the reading public, the one for four, the other for thirteen years.

However, to these excessive laudations, the author adds a brief but satisfactory biography of the poet, which has naturally laid him under obligations to Baur (and to LaCroix du Maine!), and also some account of his "love" and disciple Pernette du Guillet, and of Louise Labé, the Lyonesse Sappho. But what he omits, and what the reader would most desire is, if not a complete analysis of the *Délie* (that interesting *dizain*-sequence of which so few readers may hope to have sight), at least a critical estimate, from the point of view of technique no less than of inspiration, of a poem which had in its day such considerable influence and vogue. But here Mr. Rudmose-Brown evades the issue: "It is not easy," he says, "to give an idea of the charm of the *Délie*, of the passionate relations of the poet to Pernette du Guillet, of the difficult perfection of his verse."²⁰ On the contrary, it is quite easy; it has been done, and it should be done. Menasci, for example, has drawn attention to the extraordinary mixture in the *Délie* of tortured conceits with true poetic expression. Of the particularly elaborated conceits of one *dizain* he writes:

"Ed anche questa goffa accozzaglia di endecasillibi è preceduta nella raccolta, dalla stanza che conviene citare, tanto è semplice e chiara, schietta e aggraziata, tanto sentimento contiene. Esprime così bene un stato di estasi amorosa nel quale sembra si debbe dimenticare la propria personalità, come all'atto di un distacco grave, di cui dipenda un cambiamento di condizione." Elsewhere he adds: "Certe strofe hanno tutta l'eleganza semplice, tutto l'atteggiamento, di poesia francese, superiore magari per l'ispirazione alle finezze della scuola di Marot; in altre spira già un alito di Rinascimento."²¹

But Mr. Rudmose-Brown might have quoted from a source no more abstruse than Brunetière. That author has a page of judicious criticism which does full justice to Scève's poetry.

"Les plus jolis vers de Marot ne sont en vérité que d'un spirituel prosateur, mais ceux-ci sont d'un musicien; ils sont d'un artiste; ils sont d'un poète. L'harmonie encore un peu sévère en a quelque chose de caressant pour l'oreille; les mots y sont choisis, pesés, et mis en place par une main diligente et habile; ce qu'on essaie de leur faire dire n'est déjà plus rien de vulgaire ni de superficiel. Maître Clément se jouait ou s'égayait encore à la surface des choses; sa prose gentiment rimée n'en dessinait que le contour le plus extérieur; on ne trouve point de profondeur ni d'intériorité dans les plus agréables Épitres: celui-ci, plus délicat, plus savant, plus inquiet aussi,—je veux dire agité d'une autre et plus noble inquiétude que de faire sortir quelques écus de l'escarcelle royale,—tâche à saisir les vraies réalités sous les apparences qui n'en sont que l'enveloppe, et il y réussit quelquefois.

Toute douceur d'amour est detrempee
De fiel amer et de mortel venin. . . .

Ne sentez-vous pas bien ce que deux vers, oui, deux vers seulement de cette force et de cette gravité,—dont il n'y a pas une syllabe qui ne sonne, en quelque

¹⁹ Charles Fontaine, *La Fontaine d'Amour* (Marnef, 1546), fol. Miiij v^o.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 26.

²¹ *Nuovi saggi di letteratura francese* (Leghorn, 1908), pp. 100 and 101.

manière à l'unisson du sentiment douloureux et passionné qu'ils expriment,—ont et auront toujours, d'éloquent, de poétique?"²²

Professor Rudmose-Brown might also have said something of Scève's singular choice of *genre*—a sequence, yet not a sonnet-sequence (the innovation would at that date have been too great in France); nor yet, in slavish imitation of Seraphino, a sequence of *strambotti*; but rather something native and traditional united to the new, a sequence accordingly of truly French *disains*. Nor should the Italian sources of Scève's conceits—revealed with so much patient scholarship by Vianey²³—have passed unnoticed, nor that strange cabalistic arrangement of the poems into groups of nine, first remarked upon by Brunetière, which, in conjunction with the poet's deliberate obscurities, show him taking account of the old tradition that would have Poet and Mage one and the same thing.

In the essay on Ronsard fresh ground is broken by drawing especial attention to the series of political poems inspired by the wars of Religion, and an interesting study is offered of the poet's change of attitude as events proceeded. Mr. Rudmose-Brown notes that this aspect of Ronsard's work has been much neglected, and he does his readers a service in dwelling upon it. The rest of the chapter consists of the biography—chiefly the amatory biography—of the poet. It dwells upon his state of feeling for his successive loves, but attempts no serious criticism of the great poetry to which those loves gave birth. And it neglects, also, apart from a vague reference, any account of Ronsard's share in the humanistic reform of poetry, of metric and of language, so dear to his group, and so important, as it turned out, to the history of French literature.

The interval between Ronsard's day and the nineteenth century is partly bridged by an essay on *The Poets of the Eighteenth Century*, which gives a pleasant picture of the light side, the garden side, of that period. "Like many another," remarks a recent review of the book in the *New York Evening Post*, "(the author) writes as if this was the only side of one of the most brutal and naturalistic centuries the world has seen."²⁴ However, Mr. Rudmose-Brown very picturesquely sets his garden scene for 1750, 1770, and again for 1783, and exhibits conspicuous personages of those periods walking therein.

For the rest, this essay is a frank attempt to interest his readers in the minor poets of the century, and more especially in the Abbé Delille and the Chevalier Bertin, who "sound between them the gamut of French verse." He will undoubtedly succeed in doing this, and it is the more to be regretted that he should permit himself to say "advisedly" that Delille is the purest and clearest of French poets since Racine, and that Bertin has softness and music and passion *more than any before or since*.²⁵ There are also other things in the context to give a judicious reader pause. Rousseau, to take an instance, is thrice referred to as "howling." However unwelcome his teachings may have been to secluded poets, it is not easily forgotten that Rousseau clothed them in golden, imperishable eloquence.

When he comes to deal with Leconte de Lisle, Professor Rudmose-Brown,

²² *Études critiques*, 6^{me} Série Hachette, 1899), p. 87.

²³ *Le Pétrarquisme en France au xv^e Siècle*. Paris, 1909, pp. 58-80.

²⁴ *Evening Post*, Feb. 23d, 1918.

²⁵ The italics are mine.

dissenting from Baudelaire's disproportionate praise of the descriptive poems, and passing the love poems also by, gives the palm to the *Poèmes antiques* and *La Vêrandah*. He makes light also of Leconte de Lisle's poems on the middle ages, "which he did not understand," and of those on modern civilization, which, like the former, "sin against his own canons of art." The poet's political views call forth a page of really astute criticism:

"Men like Leconte de Lisle are Rebels against the social order and accepted doctrine of the age in which they live. They are the leaven of the world, like the religions we profess but do not practice. But if once their ideas win and take a firm hold on the world, they lose interest in them. They cannot be on the side of the majority."²⁶

Professor Rudmose-Brown also strikes a telling note in his summing up of Leconte de Lisle's attitude towards life, of "the hollow splendor" of the poet who "died bowed before a memory, when before him, had he only eyes to see, Beauty immortal walked the earth."²⁷

When, however, his readers come upon the essay on Verlaine, which Mr. Rudmose-Brown in his prefatory note attributes "almost entirely" to a friend of his, Mr. Cyril Crevequer, they might well wish that Sainte-Beuve's critical method had less vitality in it. Remy de Gourmont, who practiced it himself, remarks, writing of Verlaine: "La méthode de Sainte-Beuve et de Taine est ici en défaut, et je n'ai jamais su par quoi la remplacer."²⁸ Even Remy de Gourmont himself might advantageously have confined his trenchant and subtle criticism to Verlaine's work, and have left his life alone. Anatole France's brilliant cruelty were yet more easily spared. The tradition that some of the greatest poetry that France has produced must needs be always lit up by the glare of a disordered life should be allowed to die out; for that poetry has substance enough to be studied most advantageously *in vacuo*. But tradition is too strong. "With Verlaine more than with most poets,"—Mr. Rudmose-Brown, or Mr. Crevequer, harks back to this—"the man and his work are inextricably bound up"; and he follows his predecessors. "On les voit pulluler, on les entend bourdonner dans ce foyer de putréfaction." The consequence of this attitude on the author's part is an air of condescension towards a poet who must look back to Villon to find his equal in poignant beauty, and an absence of any adequate critical estimate of Verlaine's production, which is, after all, what we expect of a "study."

Taking the volume as a whole, it may be said that its strength lies in picturesque description and lively narrative which vividly portray a given period, and which, backed by sound knowledge, make it a valuable book for the general reader. Its weakness is in its critical judgments. Two examples, of many, may suffice. The author has this to say of Molière:

But Molière, a writer of comedy, does not claim to mould society like tragic and epic poets, but only to amuse with propriety those who already conform to the conduct and attitude of all decent citizens. To aim at pleasing these is in fact accepting the desirability of adapting Art to the needs of polite society. He is, if not (in Lemoyne's words), a "Parfumeur" or a "Faiseur de Ragoûts," at least little more than a "Bateleur de Réduits" and a "Plaisant de Ruelles." He would have been ineffably shocked at the bare idea that the end of Art could

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 69.

²⁷ P. 78.

²⁸ *Promenades littéraires*, 4^{me} Série (1912), p. 21.

possibly be the expression of the poet's personality. He agreed with Boileau in laughing to scorn those "dissidents" and "Libertins" who preferred to think for themselves, to write for themselves, to be themselves.²⁹

This, of the author of *L'Avare* and *Le Misanthrope*, indicates actual critical blindness. Elsewhere, writing of the effects of the Renaissance, Mr. Rudmose-Brown says: "And never more will the search for Beauty, this *ripae ulterioris amor*, cease to be a mainspring of life in the Latin countries."³⁰ In France at least it is not such. French literature has always, even, for the most part, at the Platonizing moment of the Renaissance, held steadily to the *ripae ceterioris amor*; not (of all things) mysticism, but "du bon sens et de l'art" has been its dominant note.

The style of the book also leaves something to be desired, and this something is chiefly restraint. "We tire of the perpetual lushness in which (it) wallows," to use one of its author's own phrases (he uses it of Ronsard!). As he might himself have put it, Professor Rudmose-Brown lights his readers to the bower of Our Lady Beauty (this irritating phrase occurs again and again in the volume) with the smoky torch of rhetoric. He would have disarmed his readers had he warned them that his matter was originally cast in the form of lectures,—as it must have been. To read the book aloud is to come upon many a fine cadence of sure appeal to a listening audience; but the eye and inward ear are more fastidious. Of Leconte de Lisle, Mr. Rudmose-Brown writes: "His Gods are Gods of light and harmony, but their light is the crudeness of the sun on white marble and their harmony has no place for the subtle and dangerous and penetrating chords of Debussy and Moussorgsky."³¹ Again, when speaking of Merrill's *Le Vagabond*:

"For only beyond Gethsemane and the Crown of Thorns, beyond Lethe and the 'moonless mere of sighs' lies the fulness of body and soul that we seek. It is well indeed that Nora Murray, in her passionate need for self-revelation, should send Ireland to Hell sooner than lose herself, but it is necessary also, to take an example from another Irish play, that Michael should forget his bride and follow Kathleen, the daughter of sorrows."³²

This trick of allusion quite extraneous to the subject in hand might well catch the attention and fix the impressions of a classroom of students (and especially—in the last instance—of Irish students), but for the general reader, Debussy and Moussorgsky, Nora Murray and Michael, "que diable allaient-ils faire dans cette galère?"

A word should be said, in conclusion, of Mr. Rudmose-Brown's admirable gift of translation. Here, so far as Verlaine's poetry is concerned, he benefited by the collaboration of his friend, Cyril Crevequer; but his own renderings give no less evidence of the fine ear, skill in metric, and delicate sense of style which the translator of verse must have at his call.

We must not, then, look to this author for new appreciations of French literature, nor for orderly exposition of its treasures, still less for any enhancement

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 14.

³⁰ P. 21.

³¹ P. 64.

³² P. 107 *et seq.*

of his subject-matter by the charms of style; but we have to thank him for many a vivid page, and in particular, for popularizing Scève and the French pre-Renaissance, and for drawing the attention of general readers to the two French poets in whom we, as Americans, may justly claim part and lot. Merrill's half-humorous outbursts against his native land, which Mr. Rudmose-Brown reports, need not be taken tragically. They are the kind of thing a young man gives vent to in conversation among friends to strike an attitude or to make people gasp, never dreaming that they will be printed. And it does seem a singular lack of tact to print them, especially at this time. Professor Rudmose-Brown would have done better to leave them in his notes, as they are not very witty, and certainly not profound, and might conceivably give pain. None knew better than Stuart Merrill that

"Words spoken are like flakes of snow
That blow and drift and vanish: write them down,
They are the witnesses to crown a man
Or slay him."

CAROLINE RUUTZ-REES

GREENWICH, CONN.

Prado (y Ugarteche), Javier: El Genio de la Lengua y de la Literatura Castellana y sus Caracteres en la Historia Intellectual del Perú. Lima, Imprenta del Estado, 1918. 4to, 194 pp.

What Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo did for Latin-American literature as a whole, what James Fitzmaurice-Kelly did for the literature of Spain and what Edmund Gosse has done for English letters has now been done for Peruvian literature by Dr. Javier Prado y Ugarteche, the learned Rector of the Universidad Mayor de San Marcos, in Lima.

The first part of Dr. Prado's work (pages 1-35) is taken up with a brief but adequate description of what may be called the European background of all Latin-American literature. He traces the origin and growth of the Spanish language up to the sixteenth century. The second part (pages 35-109) is divided into five sections, each one of which treats of some aspect of the literature of the colonial period in Peru. The first section of the second part brings to our attention the interesting fact that the well-developed native languages of Peru (Quechua¹ and Aymara) had a very small influence upon the Spanish tongue of that country. While this is quite true, Dr. Prado neglects to point out that the indigenous speech of the land has representation in literature through the *Ollantay* and a number of other by no means despicable dramas, all dating, in their present form, from post-Conquest days. He also fails to mention that Quechua and Aymara are still vigorously thriving languages. The reason why they have influenced Spanish so little is probably a social one: The masters spoke Spanish among themselves and the Indian servant or slave class spoke Quechua or Aymara, the two groups of speech mingling hardly at all.

The first literary productions of Peru not unnaturally reflected the uncertainties of the troublous times in which the Conquest was carried into effect.

¹ Cf. E. C. Hills, *The Quechua Drama, Ollanta*, ROMANIC REVIEW, Vol. V (1914), pp. 127-176.

Poetry, of which there was a little, was chiefly distinguished by a certain not unattractive soldierly roughness, but the chronicles in prose, containing vivid accounts of the wars of the Spaniards with the subjects of the Incas and of the settlement of the country, are, in many cases, of the highest literary excellence. Some of the chief chroniclers were Francisco de Jerez, Pedro Sarmiento de Gamboa, Polo de Ondegardo and José de Acosta, all of whom wrote in the sixteenth century. In the next century flourished the great writers Garcilaso de la Vega el Inca and Bernabé Cobo. The prose style of the former is magnificent, the equal of anything of the sort in all Spanish literature. In this same period, that is to say, in the first half of the seventeenth century, there were produced several excellent poems, notably the *Cristiada* of Diego de Hojeda (1611) and the *Discurso en loor de la poesía* by the anonymous poetess *Clarisa*. Dr. Prado half sustains Ricardo Palma in his belief that *Clarisa* and her equally mysterious contemporary *Amarilis* were not women. In this, for reasons I mean to explain at another time, I cannot agree.

The rest of the second section of the work outlines in a masterly manner the growth of each phase of colonial Peruvian literature, and it is enriched by many well-constructed passages which show the social and political background against which these phases were thrown into relief. Here and there one is delighted to find quotations from the chief poets mentioned, quotations which possess the rare quality of aptness. The exact effect of Góngora's style upon Peruvian letters is characterized in a very clear and concise manner by Dr. Prado, as are all the other causes for modifications in Peruvian colonial literature.

The third and last section of the book is taken up with a similarly satisfying account of the development of letters under the Republic.

Although one regrets the scarcity of birth- and death-dates (only one set, that on page 121, being given), and although it is a pity that the valuable bibliographical references appearing in the footnotes have not been gathered into a formal bibliography, the book leaves very little to be desired. Dr. Prado's style is so lucid that even the rather long lists of names which frequently occur are not a burden. He never fails to give us ample material for picturing to ourselves the conditions which gave rise to literary transitions and for understanding the manner in which the various periods of Peruvian letters waxed and waned. Although printed in Lima, where, I regret to say, careless type-setting, bad printing and wretched paper are the general rule, this book is of the highest typographical excellence. The paper is of good quality; the print is clear and firm; the ink is really black (not muddy gray); there are not more than six misprints, and the manner in which the pages are set up is very pleasing. On page 61, one is somewhat surprised by the form of the name Luis de Góngora y Argote, for, although generally known by the name of Góngora (his mother's family name), the writer designated was really Luis de Argote y Góngora. But, when all is said, Dr. Prado y Ugarteche and his publisher have given us an admirable literary history splendidly set forth in print.

PHILIP AINSWORTH MEANS

LIMA, PERU, March 4, 1918

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

VOL. X—APRIL-JUNE, 1919—No. 2

THE COMPOSITION OF THE OLD FRENCH PROSE *LANCELOT*

(Continued from vol. X, page 66)

III. THE SO-CALLED *Agravain*

In the last few pages I have already had to discuss the beginning of this section. I will turn now to V, 59–87: The story here breaks off the adventures of the questers and returns to Arthur at the point where these knights of the quest had first gone forth in search of Lancelot. The King is sad because of the news which Guinevere had given him (IV, 320) of Lancelot's condition after his combat with the disguised Bohort. Lionel, who had not figured as an actor in the *Lancelot* since IV, 235 (tournament between the champions of the Chastel as Dames and the Chastel as Puceles, respectively)—so long before the present quest began—appears at court, learns from the Queen the cause of the general depression and recognizes as Bohort (p. 60) the wounded knight, who had himself wounded Lancelot. Bohort is named now for the first time in the whole adventure, which began as far back as IV, 301. The Lady of Galvoie comes to court to seek a champion, and, in default of Lancelot and Gawain, accepts Bohort, who has recovered. He and Lionel had intended to join the quest for Lancelot anyhow, so he undertakes to redress her wrong *en passant*. Guinevere grieves at parting with Lancelot's cousins, for she is dependent on them for sympathy. After their departure she dreams that she sees Lancelot in bed with a beautiful girl, and is made jealous thereby.¹²⁹ She

¹²⁹ The girl meant is not Pelles's daughter, as one might at first suppose, but the damsel who cured Lancelot after he had drunk of the poisoned spring, V, 72 ff. The dream is, of course, premonitory, for the girl in question is only introduced, p. 74.

sends for the Lady of the Lake, with whom she wishes to confer about Lancelot. Lancelot is healed, acts as protector to a girl, sends news of his recovery to Guinevere, but is again in great peril, because he drank of a poisoned spring (p. 71), inhabited by two serpents, which had infected it with their venom. A damsel, who was skilled in herbs, nurses him back to health, and during his convalescence Bohort and Lionel discover him. Lancelot had lost his nails and hair (p. 73) through the effect of the poison. The hair he sends to Guinevere by Lionel. She is alarmed at the news of Lancelot's fresh misfortune, but, desiring to see him, on Lionel's advice, she induces Arthur to proclaim a tournament, her purpose being to draw Lancelot out of concealment. On going back to Lancelot, Lionel finds him in great distress of mind. His nurse has fallen in love with him and begs him for a return of her passion. He will only promise her to love her better than any other girl, and, not being moved by carnal desire, she is content with his promise, and vows, on her own part, perpetual chastity (p. 83). Lancelot aids Calles's sons against their father—fights Gawain, Gaheries and Agravain (who are on Calles's side) without knowing their identity, and slays Calles. After a brief adventure of Hector's with Terican, the brother of the giant Carados, it is related that Lancelot, being found asleep by the Queen of Sorestan, Morgan and Seville, is enchanted by them, carried off to the Chastel de la Charete and required to yield his love to one of the three. He refuses, and on the night of the fourth day is delivered from captivity by the daughter of the Duke of Rochedon, who was about to be forced by the Queen of Sorestan into marriage with the latter's brother. In return, he undertakes to frustrate the Queen's design (p. 95). After a sanguinary, though piquant, adventure, in which Lancelot kills an unjustly jealous husband, he is brought to Baudemagus (at the Castel de la Harpe) by the latter's daughter. In the tourney that follows between Baudemagus and the King of Nor-gales, Lancelot helps Baudemagus, but after winning the victory, rides away before Baudemagus can speak to him (p. 102). He accepts the invitation of a lady, who had admired his prowess at the tournament and whom he meets by chance in the forest, to stay at her castle. In proffering the invitation, she promises to show

him on the morrow the most beautiful thing he had ever seen. She carries out her promise by taking him the next day to Corbenic (p. 105), where he meets Pelles's daughter. Then comes the story of the conception of Galahad (105-112), as recounted above. Between pages 112-124 the main adventures are Lancelot's rescue from wicked knights of the damsel who had cured him of the effects of the poisoned spring, his discovery that Hector was his half-brother and his meeting with Hector's mother—lastly, the incident of the enchanted carols in the Forest Perdue, to the spell of which Lancelot, too, succumbs.

The most distinctive characteristic of pp. 59-87 is the introduction of two new *motifs*: the Queen's jealousy of Lancelot and her intimacy with Lionel and Bohort, who now become her confidants. These *motifs* are of prime importance in the *Mort Artu*, but they make their appearance here for the first time in the *Lancelot*. The whole passage, indeed, is full of *motifs* that are found also in the *Mort Artu*. In addition to the two just mentioned we have the following: (1) Calles's daughter here, pp. 74 ff., nurses Lancelot through an illness, and she cherishes and confesses an unrequited passion for him. So with the Maid of Ascalot in the *Mort Artu*, VI, 226 ff. (2) A tournament is proclaimed, pp. 78 ff., to draw Lancelot forth from his place of concealment. Cf. the *Mort Artu*, VI, 230. (3) Lancelot loves Gawain and Gaheries, and having overcome them in combat, not knowing who they were, pp. 85 ff., desires to conceal his identity. Cf. the fatal encounter of Lancelot with Gaheries in the *Mort Artu*, VI, 281 f.

Now, the introduction of the first two *motifs*, just mentioned, coincides with a change of style. We pass from the fantastic and puerile adventures of the quest for Lancelot (which are renewed in their most aggravated form on the reintroduction of Yvain, p. 124) to pictures of real human character and passion. Guinevere's dream is stamped with unmistakable pathos and power, and the same is true of the story of Calles's daughter.¹⁸⁰ Note, too, the

¹⁸⁰ The whole story of the war between Calles and his sons, V, 51 ff., shows a stronger grasp on reality than most of this part of the *Lancelot*, but it seems inseparably connected with the absurdities of IV, 303 ff., through "la vielle damoisele au cercle dor," as she is called, V, 176. When she first appears, IV, 284, she had "en son chef chapel de roses, quar ce estoit entor la Saint Jehan,"

description, pp. 65 f., of Guinevere's illness, really due to her anxiety about Lancelot, which the King interprets as simply physical—also, her assumption of cheerfulness, when she is really filled with sorrow on her lover's account. All of this is plainly beyond the reach of the author (or authors) of the bulk of this narrative of the quest for Lancelot.

If my judgment is correct in attributing to another writer the passage just discussed, I would advance a step further and identify him with the author of the *Mort Artu*. The inference which first suggests itself in the premises is that the author of the *Mort Artu* in the episodes of his romance which are similar to those now before us was merely exploiting the work of a predecessor. Indeed, these very similarities might be taken as evidence that the passages in the respective branches are by different hands. The same writer, it might be argued, would hardly repeat himself so closely. Repetition, however, of *motifs* by the same author is not uncommon in the Arthurian romances.¹³¹ The Middle Ages, in fact, were not so squeamish about such repetitions as later ages have been, although there are many examples of the phenomenon in the poetry and fiction even of recent centuries.¹³² It is to be recollected, too, that the *Lancelot* and *Mort Artu*, though branches of the same cycle, are, nevertheless, separate works, and a reader who had read the

and in return for information about the Red Knight, she exacts a promise of Lancelot that he will follow her, whenever summoned to do so. At IV, 303, she is wearing a "cercle dor" instead of the "chapel de roses," and she calls Lancelot away from his combat with the disguised Bohort. She will not mention the task which she wishes Lancelot to execute (cp. especially on this subject, V, 71), but, retarded by many adventures (IV, 302 ff., 316 ff., V, 67, 69, 71 f.), she finally brings him (V, 84 f.) to the assistance of Calles's sons and congratulates him (p. 87) when he has vanquished their opponents.—If I am right in ascribing V, 59 ff. to a new author, this author interweaves his addition with the story of Calles's wars (cp. 84 ff.), as the author of the Bohort episodes, IV, 215 ff., did his with the *Charete* story.—The passage, IV, 319 f., describing Guinevere's grief on account of her anxiety for Lancelot, prepares us for V, 59 ff., and is probably from the same pen.

¹³¹ For repetition in Chrétien see W. Foerster's discussion, pp. 163 f. of the Introduction to his *Wörterbuch* (Halle, 1914) of that poet's works.

¹³² Cp., for example, Shakespeare's plays. The Biron-Rosaline *motif* of "*Love's Labor's Lost*" is repeated in *Much Ado* (Benedict-Beatrice), the Julia *motif* of the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* in *Twelfth Night* (Viola).—Richardson used the abduction *motif* in all his novels.

one was by no means sure of having read the other, or, at any rate, his reading of the two would probably be divided by such an interval that the similarity of *motifs* would pass unnoticed, to a large extent. After all, if the writer of one of the branches had no scruples about borrowing *motifs* from another branch, he is not likely to have been very scrupulous about borrowing from himself.

It is to be considered, furthermore, that the passage, V, 215 ff., which describes how Lancelot painted pictures of the incidents of his career (including his love-affair with Guinevere) on the walls of his prison is, as we shall see, beyond any reasonable doubt, the insertion of the author of the *Mort Artu*, so that the fact that the episodes that we are now discussing as so similar should occur in separate branches does not tell against the identification which I have proposed. On the other hand, the similarity of style of these *Lancelot* episodes to that of the *Mort Artu* is such as no imitator could compass. Looking at the question from this point of view alone, we should have the strongest grounds for assuming identical authorship.

It is hard to accept pp. 87-91 (the adventures of Lionel and Hector at the hill which Terican, brother of the giant, Carados, defends) as from the same author as pp. 59-87, which, like the *Mort Artu*, does not run into such empty descriptions of combats. Besides, the passage is incomplete without its sequel, 204 ff., where Lancelot kills Terican and (through Gaheries) liberates Hector and the rest, and in the part of the romance where this sequel occurs there is no material that betrays the same hand as pp. 59-87. I would consequently assign these Terican adventures to the *Lancelot* in an earlier form.

Pp. 91-105 (Lancelot's captivity at the hands of Morgan and the two queens, his liberation by Meleagant's sister and his participation in the tourney on the side of her father, Baudemagus, against the King of Norgales) does not bear so plainly the stamp of the style of the *Mort Artu* as pp. 59-87, but is, nevertheless, in all likelihood, by the same author. It is far superior to the quest for Lancelot in general, being free from insipidities and extravagances. It is connected with the preceding (p. 88) by the idea that Lancelot was taken captive, whilst asleep, and by the references to his loss

of half after drinking of the poisoned spring (p. 73). Morgan (p. 93) and Meleagant's sister at first (p. 97), like Gaheries (p. 87), fail to recognize him on that account. Morgan is introduced, p. 91, as if the reader had never heard of her. The Queen of So-restan, when she comes upon Lancelot asleep, calls to two ladies, "dout li vne auoit a non Morgue la fee & lautre Sebile." The author connects the episode with the *Charete* story, IV, 155 ff., by making the three enchantresses imprison Lancelot in a Chastel de la Charete (not mentioned before in the *Lancelot*) and by representing Meleagant's sister as the instrument of his deliverance.

As I have stated, there is no reason to ascribe the narrative covered by pp. 91-105 to the author of the *Mort Artu*, except that it is in a superior style and continues the episodes, pp. 59-87, which we have reasons for connecting with that writer. Perhaps, too, one may add that in the scene (p. 93) of the three queens who require Lancelot to choose one of their number, we have probably a classical reminiscence—the Judgment of Paris—as we have in the scene of his captivity in Morgan's house, V, 217 (Aeneas's flight from Troy), which is certainly from the same hand as the *Mort Artu*.¹³³ Note, too, that Guinevere is called, p. 93, "fontaine de toute biaute"¹³⁴ as nowhere else, save in the *Mort Artu*, VI, 205—also, that here alone (V, 100 f.), outside of the *Mort Artu*, does Mador de la Porte appear as an actor.¹³⁵

One might at first be inclined to include among the expansions effected by the author of the *Mort Artu* the story of the conception of Galahad, V, 105 ff., which I have already discussed in the section on References. The unascetic tone of the passage accords with the style of that writer, and there are some rather noteworthy agreements in phrasing between the account (109 f.) of the drugging of Lancelot (by Brisane's damsel) so as to deceive him into

¹³³ To be sure, in the later episode of Lancelot's imprisonment in Morgan's house, V, 215 ff., there is no allusion to his earlier captivity in the Chastel de la Charete, V, 92 ff. Both were suggested, doubtless, by Morgan's imprisonment of Lancelot, IV, 124 ff.

¹³⁴ The MS. which Sommer follows has "totes biautez," but the singular is found in MS. 342, and, doubtless, other MSS.

¹³⁵ Even the name occurs only twice elsewhere in the *Lancelot*, viz., III, 159, V, 236—in each case in one of those lists of names (here of prisoners) which the scribes expanded according to their pleasure.

cohabitation with Pelles's daughter, and the account (216) of his subjection to the same process by Morgan's damsel—a passage which, as I have already said, there is every reason to ascribe to the author of the *Mort Artu*. Cf. “Et il prent la coupe et le boit toute plaine et trueue la puison boine et douce” (p. 110) and “si but de la puison que la damoisele li donna en vne cope dargent et il le trueue douce et boine” (p. 215). On the other hand, as I have set forth above, the author of V, 105 ff., evidently knew Gawain's visit to Corbenic, IV, 339 ff., in which the *Mort Artu* is used. The present passage, therefore, can hardly be by the author of the *Mort Artu*. I do not believe that pp. 112–124 (from the point where Lancelot, having begotten Galahad, leaves Corbenic, to the resumption of the adventures of the original questers with the introduction of Ywain) is entirely by the author of the episode of Galahad's conception, which immediately precedes it. The reappearance of the girl who healed Lancelot, after he had drunk of the poisoned spring, connects these episodes in part with V, 84, and it seems most likely that what is here said about this girl is from the same pen as what is said of her previously. On the other hand, the story of the carols in the Forest Perdue (to say nothing of the Hector adventures, 117 ff.)—probably imitated, as we have seen, from *Meraugis de Portlesgues*—is apparently older than the passages which I am now discussing as expansions. The next of the passages which I shall take up affords ground for this opinion.

V, 165–190.

The main incidents related in these pages are Lancelot's rescue of the daughter of the Duke of Rochedon from a hateful marriage with the brother of the Queen of Sorestan and his victory (with the assistance of Baudemagus) over the companions of the Round Table, in which he is not recognized because of his disguise.¹³⁶ Immediately after comes the summary of the exploits of Lancelot

¹³⁶ The tournament is at Camelot. The whole episode is an imitation of III, 210 ff. (the assemblies of Galehaut, in which Lancelot, disguised, plays much the same rôle). Lancelot's paralysis in the midst of the fight on seeing Guineveré, p. 176, is imitated from III, 206. This *motif*, which seems absurd enough to the modern reader, evidently enjoyed great favor in the Middle Ages as the last refinement of the *amour courtois*. It was introduced into Arthurian romance by Chrétien de Troyes, *Lancelot*, 3685 ff.

and Gawain. We have here, in my opinion, an unmistakable sign of expansion in the following circumstance: At p. 153 Guinevere had received the self-playing chessmen from Lancelot, but she only thanks him for the marvellous gift at p. 188 (at the end of the tourney in which he vanquishes the knights of the Round Table), and then in the most natural manner, as if she were availing herself of the first opportunity she had had. As a matter of fact, she had lain with him twice (pp. 183, 184) in the interval. The expansion begins, I believe, with p. 165, l. 8, where Lancelot, having been healed, leaves the widow's house and goes to the "Chastel de la Charrette." This castle is peculiar to pp. 91-105 and 165-190, and the same thing is true of the Queen of Soresan and the daughter of the Duke of Rochedon. The expanded passage (as I regard it) begins:

"Si cheualcherent tant qu'il vindrent a vn chastel que on apeloit le Chastel de la Charrete au terme que la damoisele y ot mis."

This nonchalant way of referring to an incident seventy pages back (p. 95), where Lancelot, in gratitude for his liberation from the Castel de la Charete by the daughter of the Duke of Rochedon, promises her to be on hand the day that is set for her compulsory marriage to the brother of the Queen of Soresan, confirms our suspicion of interpolation. The reintroduction of the Duke's daughter, after this long interval, as merely "la damoisele" betrays the hand of the interpolator who had so recently written the previous interpolation that he forgets the long interval which separates the passages. One is entirely unprepared for this indefinite appellation as applied to a character who has been so long absent from the scene, and only a close examination of the respective passages reveals the fact that the damsel in question is not "la damoisele" who has been similarly referred to just two lines before—the one who, having been saved by Lancelot from burning at the stake (p. 163), accompanied him further on his journey.

Now, inasmuch as we have here an interpolation thrust into the enchanted carols and chessmen episode (pp. 153 f., 188 ff.), no doubt we have the same thing in their relation to that episode (pp. 121 ff.) in the case of the incidents, pp. 113 ff., discussed above.

Within pp. 165-188, the incident (pp. 167 f.) of the knight's fulfilling his promise to Lancelot and taking to the various courts the corpse of the girl he had slain (p. 160) is probably a part of the earlier narrative, and not of the intercalation, for it is a necessary sequel to pp. 160 ff. On the other hand, certain references in the dialogue between Morgan and Lancelot on p. 167 are from the interpolator's hand. They connect the present interpolation with the episode of Lancelot's imprisonment (pp. 91 ff.) by Morgan and the two queens and with the episode yet to come (pp. 215 ff.) of his imprisonment by Morgan in her "manoir." Both of these passages are, as already stated, no doubt relatively late expansions and from the same pen as the present passage.—Similarly, the scene, pp. 178 ff., between Guinevere and the girl who cured Lancelot after he had drunk of the poisoned spring harks back to the passage, pp. 59-87, which I have given reasons for accepting as by the author of the *Mort Artu*. The girdle which excites the Queen's jealousy (p. 179) is the one which she had presented to Lancelot and which he in turn had given to this girl (p. 84) on her begging him for a keepsake after the poisoned spring affair. The *motifs* of the Queen's jealousy and her intimacy with Bohort, which I commented on above as characteristic of pp. 59-87 and of the *Mort Artu*, it will be observed, recur here, along with the subtler psychology of those episodes on which I have also remarked. Notice, for example, pp. 178 f., how the jealous Guinevere, in rebuking the girl just mentioned for robbing another woman of Lancelot's love, pretends that she is merely indignant on behalf of "vne haute dame qui moult est ma mie," whereas she is, of course, really speaking for herself. This is quite in the style of pp. 59 ff., and infinitely removed from the puerilities of the quest for Lancelot in this volume.

The references to the Grail quest on p. 193, discussed above, show that this passage, which probably embraces p. 192, l. 12 (approximately), to p. 194, l. 13, was indisputably not a part of the original *Lancelot*, but whether it is by the same hand as pp. 166-188 is difficult to decide. The reference (p. 193), however, to the tomb adventures of IV, 174 ff., and the ascetic tone of this reference seem to weigh heavily against such a supposition. The summary of Lancelot's and of Gawain's adventures (including, p. 191, an

allusion to the final battle at Salisbury in the *Mort Artu* and, p. 192, another to Gawain's death, also in that romance), which Arthur has recorded by his clerks (pp. 190-192), is undoubtedly a late insertion,¹⁸⁷ like the other summaries of this nature (III, 429, IV, 296, V, 130, 332) in the *Lancelot*. The suggestion came first, as seems manifest, from de Borron's *Merlin*, where Blaise regularly records the deeds of Merlin. Such summaries were useful, no doubt, to contemporary readers as rudimentary tables of contents.

V, 215-223.

We have here the story of how Lancelot, being imprisoned by Morgan in "le plus fort manoir del monde, quar elle y quidoit bien Lancelot tenir a tous iors mes," sees one day a man painting¹³⁸ the history of Aeneas (his flight from Troy) and decided that

"se la chambre ou il gisoit estoit aussi pourtraite de ses fais & de ses dis molt li plairoit a ueoir les biaux contenemens de sa dame & molt li seroit grans alegemens de ses maus. Lors prie au prodomme qui paignoit qui(1) li donnast de sez colours a faire en la cambre ou il gisoit .j. ymage. Et il dist que si feroit il volentiers. Si len bailla maintenant tous les estrumens qui aferoient a cel mestier."

Lancelot uses these materials to set forth in pictures his own career¹³⁹ from the time that he started for Camelot with the Lady

¹⁸⁷ Within this summary, the words, p. 190, "Apres iure mesire Gauvain & Bohors & Gaheries" are probably a still later insertion, for, as Sommer, note 2, has pointed out, they contradict what precedes it and the express statement on p. 191, "Si conta mesires Gauvain les soies [*i. e.*, auventures] apres, mais il ne li conuint mie iurer, quar il auoit iure au mouvoir de cort." The knights are taking the oath to relate the truth in regard to their adventures.

¹³⁸ The writer says that the painter "paignoit vne ancienne ystoire & desus chascune ymage auoit lettres qui disoient le sens de la peinture." This is quite in the mediæval style. When Lancelot looks more closely, he perceives that the man is painting the story of Aeneas.

¹³⁹ In my note to the passage in the *Mort Artu*, where Morgan shows these pictures to Arthur (cf. p. 272 of my edition of that romance), I have cited the passages in earlier romances which Bédier and Novati have connected the present episode of the *Lancelot* with, viz., Thomas's *Tristan*, I, 309 (Bédier's edition), and *Roman de Troie*, 14583 ff., respectively. Although I added other parallels, I was then inclined to accept the description (Salle aux Images) in the *Tristan* as the source of the *Lancelot* episode, but there it is a question of statues, not paintings, and, after all, the main distinctive resemblance between the passages is in the caresses which the lover lavishes on the image of his

of the Lake on, and also the careers of the other characters who have figured in the narrative (p. 218). Lancelot delights especially in the image of Guinevere, bows before it and kisses it. Morgan had observed Lancelot's pictures from the first night after he began them, but she permitted him to continue them in order that he might compromise himself:

"Or ne lairoye, fait Morgue, en nulle maniere que iou cel pain-tre ne tenisse tant que toute ceste cambre ne fust painte, car iou sai bien quil y paindera toutes les oeures de lui & de la royne; et se il auoit tout paint lors si feroie iou tant que li roys Artus y uendroit, et puis si li feroie connoistre lez fais & la uerite de Lancelot & de la royne" (p. 218).

Morgan's motive was jealousy:

"Car elle lamoit tant comme femme pooit plus amer homme, pour la grant biaute de lui, si estoit moult dolente de ce quil ne le uoloit amer par amors, quar elle len auoit mainte fois proiet, mais il ne len voloit oir."¹⁴⁰

After being in prison for two winters and one summer (p. 222), he escapes by the same means as he had employed in Chrétien's *Lancelot*, 4654 ff., in gaining access to Guinevere, viz., by breaking the bars out of the windows with his bare hands.

mistress.—The closest parallel to our *Lancelot* episode is one which I have latterly observed, viz., the description of the pictures embroidered by Philomena in a "cortine" which we find in ll. 1088 ff. of the twelfth century *Philomena* (ascribed by some scholars, including its editor, to Chrétien de Troyes). C. de Boer has extracted the story from the *Ovide Moralisé* and edited it separately (Paris, 1909). By means of these pictures Philomena (Philomela) informs her sister of the wrongs she has suffered. De Boer does not observe that the French poet has here altered his Latin original, *Metamorphoses*, VI, 576 ff., where Philomela conveys to Procne news of the outrages which Tereus has inflicted on her by means of embroidered *letters*, not pictures. Only in the *Philomena* and in the *Lancelot* (*Mort Artu*) do the pictures (in each case executed by a captive) serve not merely the purpose of decoration, but convey information that is important in the development of the narrative. Such themes, however, were in the air, and, possibly, the coincidence between the works in question may be accidental.

¹⁴⁰ Since Morgan was jealous, it does not really conflict with this passage when V, 166 f., it is said that she hated Lancelot most of all men. Later references to the present episode will be found, V, 237, 296, 310 f., 322. These allusions are due, no doubt, to redactors or to authors of parts of the *Lancelot* which were written after the present episode.

This whole episode, which is a striking one and altogether above the level of most of Vol. V, is closely attached to the trivial adventures that surround it and, indeed, are interwoven with it (pp. 219-222). The sequel is found in the *Mort Artu*, VI, 236 ff., where Morgan entices Arthur into her forest dwelling (here described as a "chastel"),¹⁴¹ and having convinced him by the pictures of Lancelot's intrigue with Guinevere, urges him to vengeance. It is perfectly obvious that the *Lancelot* episode is without meaning except as preparing for its sequel in the *Mort Artu*.¹⁴² The two passages must be by the same hand. Now, there is no reason whatever for regarding the sequel as an interpolation in the *Mort Artu*. It is one of the finest things in that romance and does not differ in style from the best passages in it. The two passages, then, must be by the author of the *Mort Artu*. This conclusion is inescapable and affords valuable testimony as to the manner in which the original *Lancelot* grew ultimately to the huge bulk which the romance has attained in our MSS. and also as to the manner in which it was linked with the other members of the cycle.

V, 284-285.

The hermit reveals the fact to Mordred that he is the child of incest and predicts that Mordred and his father (Arthur) will slay each other. Mordred, enraged at the prophecy, kills the hermit.

I have already discussed this episode very minutely above, in the section on References, especially in its relations to the *Mort Artu*, where the hermit's prediction is fulfilled. It remains, however, to inquire whether we have here a passage like the story of the conception of Galahad, V, 105 ff., which has its indispensable sequel in the *Queste*, yet is certainly not by the author of the *Queste*,

¹⁴¹ In the continuation of Chrétien's *Perceval* by Wauchier de Denain, ll. 30369 and 30541, respectively, we have the habitation of an enchantress called indifferently *manoir* and *castel*.

¹⁴² P. Märtens, E. Boehmer's *Romanische Studien*, V, 557 ff. (1880), made this remark. On the basis of this episode which is commenced in the *Agravain* (last division of the *Lancelot*) and concluded in the *Mort Artu*, I inferred (p. xxxiii of the Introduction to my edition of the latter) that the two had the same author. The inference, however, was too sweeping, as the present article shows.

Arthur ends his visit to Morgan in the *Mort Artu*, VI, 247. There is an allusion to this visit, it would seem, as late as VI, 273.

or one like the story of Lancelot's imprisonment by Morgan in her forest dwelling, which, in a similar manner, is indissolubly connected with its sequel in the *Mort Artu*, but is unquestionably, one may say, from the same hand as the *Mort Artu*. Obviously, as it seems to me, the Morgan episode furnishes the true parallel to the passage now before us, for in each case the correspondence between the *Lancelot* episode and its sequel in the other branch is perfect. It is possible to assert, of course, that a redactor, in the case of V, 284 f., might have been following the general method of the writer who composed the story of the conception of Galahad—only he harmonized his narrative better with the branch in which the sequel of his story was to be told. But there is no obstacle, I believe, to the simpler hypothesis of identifying the author of the passage before us with the author of the *Mort Artu*. We have seen that this writer in the Morgan episode, V, 215 ff., and, very likely, in the other passages which I have suggested, made insertions in the *Lancelot*, and so, in my opinion, we have in the present instance another example of these expansions from the same hand. I have already called attention to the partial coincidence in phrasing between V, 284 f., and the corresponding passages of the *Mort Artu*, which is no less noteworthy than the complete harmony of incident that prevails between the two. The author of the present episode, as will be observed, introduces it as an incident of the journey of Lancelot and Mordred to the tournament at Peningue.¹⁴³

V, 321–377.

This stretch of narrative is occupied with the war which Arthur and Lancelot wage against Claudas and his allies, the Romans, and terminates with the expulsion of Claudas from the dominions which he has usurped and Lancelot's recovery of his inheritance. The period which it covers extends from one Whitsuntide festival to another.

¹⁴³ The tournament of Peningue, V, 285 ff., has many features in common with the tournament at Winchester in the *Mort Artu*, VI, 207 ff. In both Lancelot on the way stays at a vavassor's house, receives from him a shield to disguise his identity, is accompanied to the tourney by a son of this vavassor (as Mordred is here also), wins the contest for the weaker side, fights Bohort and Hector incognito and receives a wound, is sought afterwards by a companion or companions. The *Mort Artu*, though superior, is probably the borrower. Similar, in some points, too, is the tournament at Camelot, V, 173 ff., which is in the part that I have ascribed to the author of the *Mort Artu*.

Preparation for the story of the war against Claudas would seem to begin as far back as V, 65 f., where Guinevere, in her anxiety about Lancelot, despatches her "cousine" to the Lady of the Lake with a message in which she urges the latter to come to her. We hear nothing more of this messenger until pp. 256 ff. There we learn that she was first delayed by illness and then intercepted by Claudas, so that she never reached her destination. She persuaded a dwarf, however, to destroy Guinevere's letter to the Lady of the Lake (which had not been mentioned, pp. 65 f.), so that it might not fall into Claudas's hands, and for this act was thrown into prison at Claudas's command. When Guinevere receives news of all this, she writes to Claudas, threatening him with vengeance if he does not release her cousin. He gives a scornful answer, in which he bids his squire say to her, among other things:

"iou ne li pris ne li ne son lecheour uailant un esperon. Et sil fust qui faire losast, on le deust miex ardoir que nulle autre femme, car elle fait couchier auecques li celui que iou bien connois qui(1) est si preus & si vaillans quil na plain piet de terre."

On receiving this insulting message, the Queen, grieved and humiliated, expresses her longing for Lancelot (p. 263), in order that he might redress her wrongs. Nothing more is said of the affair until pp. 321 f., when Lancelot has returned to court and, having related the story of his imprisonment by Morgan, is told by the Queen of the outrages which Claudas had inflicted on her in act and word. She declares that he had done so, only because he thought, like the rest of the world, that Lancelot was dead. Lancelot replies that he had postponed vengeance against Claudas for having deprived him of his inheritance until he saw his opportunity, but now that his old enemy has struck at him again through Guinevere, he will no longer delay. Guinevere, seeing him in this mood, inflames him still further. After a preliminary consultation between Lancelot and his especial intimates at court, the matter is brought to Arthur's attention, and war is decided upon and soon afterwards begun.

In the section on References above, I have already given what I trust will prove convincing reasons for regarding this episode of the wars against Claudas and the Romans as based on the story of

Arthur's wars against Lancelot and the Romans in the *Mort Artu*, VI, 311 ff. The table of references which follows upon that section shows also that in this part of the *Lancelot* there are a number of specific allusions to the *Mort Artu*. Furthermore, Claudas's familiarity with the *amours* of Lancelot and Guinevere, which is shared by nobody else in the *Lancelot*, save Lancelot's kinsmen, suggests the influence of the *Mort Artu*, where that intrigue becomes, indeed, the common talk. So, too, I believe, with his saying that Guinevere ought to be burnt for her adultery.¹⁴⁴ In my opinion, this refers to the *Mort Artu*, VI, 279 ff., where, Guinevere, having been caught with Lancelot, is led forth to suffer punishment at the stake.

There can be practically no doubt that V, 256-263, which prepares the way for the episode of the war of Lancelot and Arthur against Claudas, is by the same author as the actual narrative of that war, and it would seem, on first consideration, that the same thing is true of V, 65 f., which tells us how Guinevere in the first instance sent her cousin on the abortive errand to the Lady of the Lake. But there are some points bearing on the question yet to be noted. In the first place, there is a discrepancy between pp. 65 f. and pp. 258 ff., respectively, inasmuch as in the former Guinevere entrusts the girl with an oral message only, in the latter with a written message. Now, if pp. 65-263, inclusive, to say nothing of pp. 263-377, were all written by the same person, it might be said that after composing the long stretch of 190 big quarto pages, which separated the two passages, the author, when returning to the subject, had naturally forgotten that he had made the original message merely oral. But it is virtually certain that this whole narrative is not from the same hand. Apart from the arguments which I have presented to prove that pp. 66-87 are by the author of the *Mort Artu* and that pp. 321-377, and hence pp. 256-263, are by a person who used that romance as a source, it is not at all probable that a writer should have related the incident of Guinevere's despatching her messenger in something less than two pages (pp. 65 f.), purely with a view to the subsequent episode of the war

¹⁴⁴ Burning, it is true, is, in the romances, the usual penalty for adultery, when committed by a woman. For something corresponding in actual mediæval life see my edition of the *Mort Artu*, p. 282.

with Claudas, though not mentioning Claudas, then dropped the subject completely for 190 large quarto pages (which in the number of words it contains does not fall far short, if at all, of an average Waverley novel), then resumed it for seven pages, and after that dropped it again, to return to it only after fifty-eight more pages devoted to other incidents. In no period of history would such a procedure as this be probable, but least of all in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century (the date of the *Lancelot* in its earlier forms), when French prose was in its infancy and the longest work which it has to show (Villehardouin's *Chronicle*), outside of the Arthurian romances—the manner of whose evolution is the question at issue—is nothing like so long as the single stretch of 190 pages just mentioned.¹⁴⁵

The true explanation of the narrative, as it stands in our MSS., seems to me to be as follows: As I have already intimated, the author of the war with Claudas (and the Romans) attached his narrative to the *Lancelot* in an earlier form by interweaving it with the romance as he found it in this earlier form. But, if he did this, he, no doubt, composed consecutively the different parts of the additional material, and, if this is true, he is not likely to have been guilty of the discrepancy which I have noted above. What he probably did was to take an episode which he found in the *Lancelot* that he was expanding, but turn it to a new use. If this theory is correct, the errand of Guinevere's cousin must have had a different termination in this earlier *Lancelot*, and she may have reached her destination, after all. It may be, then, that the Queen originally received the consolation which, according to IV, 215, she was accustomed to seek from the Lady of the Lake. It is to be noted, moreover, that pp. 65 f. contain no hint that the Queen's messenger was going into an enemy's country.

I have so far assumed that the expansion for which the author of the war with Claudas and the Romans is responsible began with

¹⁴⁵ Even in our metrical romances the narrative often shows what the Germans call *Verschlingungen*, but, of course, on nothing that approaches the scale of the *Lancelot*. The *Lancelot*, as expanded in the manner described in this article, had a detrimental influence in this regard, not only on the later Arthurian romances, but, as we have seen, on European fiction down to the seventeenth century—partly by direct, partly by indirect influence.

p. 321. It is quite likely, however, that the incident of Brumant's perishing when, in spite of all warnings, he sits down in the Perilous Seat, which occupies pp. 318-321—that is, the space between the conclusion of the long quest for Lancelot (which began IV, 321) and the commencement of the episode of the war with Claudas—is from the same hand as pp. 321 ff. This passage, as we have seen, rests on the *Queste* and the *Estoire*, but a writer who borrowed from the *Mort Artu*, as we suppose the author of the episode of that war to have done, would very naturally have known the two branches just named, also, and the fact that Brumant, p. 329, is spoken of as Claudas's nephew makes one all the more disposed to view the episode relating to his death and pp. 321-377 as productions of the same author. In that case the work of this author would begin at p. 318, just after the quest for Lancelot was ended.

It should be observed, still further, in regard to the Claudas episodes with which we are dealing that, although they were suggested, of course, by the Claudas episodes at the beginning of the *Lancelot*, they are not from the same pen. The inferiority of style which marks the present narrative, as compared with the earlier one, leaves no doubt on this question.¹⁴⁶ The author of the present episode, it is true, has profited by his model, and pp. 256-263 and 322-325 are among the more interesting parts of Vol. V, but the remarkable vigor and the spirit of the *chansons de geste* which we have noted in the earlier wars of Claudas are wanting here. On the other hand, the story of Lancelot seems to require that at some time or other he should regain the patrimony of which Claudas had robbed him.¹⁴⁷ Accordingly, even in the earliest form of the romance there was very likely an episode that related such an achievement on his part, but if such was the case, it has not survived to

¹⁴⁶ The enormous extent of narrative that separates the earlier Claudas episodes (which terminate, I, 104) even from V, 256 (to say nothing of V, 321), viz., 944 pages, points to the same conclusion.—Between I, 124, and V, 256, Claudas is mentioned only five times (IV, 36, 220, V, 114, 120, 210) and in each case just incidentally.

¹⁴⁷ In Ulrich von Zatzichoven's *Lanselet*, ll. 8040 ff. (i. e., near the end of the romance), Lancelot, after many adventures, goes to recover his patrimony, but, finding his uncle there ruling in his name, leaves him in peaceful possession. He obtains another kingdom, however, through his wife, Iblis.

posterity, or, at least, has been so altered in the narrative that we have, V, 321 ff., as to be unrecognizable in its original outlines. The case would be somewhat similar to that of the story of Galahad's conception, V, 105 ff., in its relation to the (hypothetical lost) *Queste* narrative on the subject, which we must presume to have been supplanted by the narrative actually preserved (V, 105 ff.) in the *Lancelot*.

In comparing V, 321 ff., with the first part of the *Lancelot*, the following details are also significant. The Lady of the Lake has completely lost her supernatural character and Claudas has a valiant illegitimate son, Claudin, to match Ban's godson, Banin.

According to the theory which I have advanced, the author of the episode of the war with Claudas and the Romans would have had before him not only the *Queste*, *Mort Artu*, and *Estoire*, but the whole of the *Lancelot* down to V, 318, substantially as it is preserved to us in our MSS.¹⁴⁸ Now, in this episode we have V, 333 f., a dialogue between Bohort and Lancelot which is based on the accounts of Bohort's visit to Corbenic, V, 139 ff., and 294 ff., and contains references to his affair with Brangoire's daughter, IV, 267 ff. But we have seen that these Bohort adventures are, beyond question, imitations of corresponding adventures of Lancelot (V, 105 ff.), and consequently later expansions. If we regarded them, then, as of later composition than the episode of the war with Claudas, V, 321 ff., we should have to explain that dialogue as inserted in this episode by the author of the Bohort adventures just mentioned. I see, however, no reason why we should not identify the author of the war of Arthur and Lancelot against Claudas with the author of these same Bohort adventures.

V, 377-409.

These are the concluding pages of the *Lancelot*, and, I believe, the work of still another hand.¹⁴⁹ Their most distinctive feature,

¹⁴⁸ He may have used other sources for details. The name of the stronghold occupied by Claudas, V, 339 ff., "chasteau del cor," was very probably derived from the Castel del Cor episode of Wauchier de Denain's continuation to Chrétien's *Perceval*, ll. 21937 ff. There is a reason for this specific name in the latter case, none in the former.

¹⁴⁹ Sommer, V, 378, note 1, says with regard to the court which Arthur is holding at Whitsuntide at the beginning of this passage: "This court, I believe,

and one which, in my judgment, justifies the assumption of different authorship, is the introduction of Perceval here for the first time as a character in our romance. The introduction was, no doubt, suggested by the *Queste*, where this original Grail Winner, though now rejected in favor of Galahad, still plays an important rôle. Aside from this feature, as my section on References renders plain, pp. 377-409 exhibit an unmistakable knowledge of both the *Queste* and the *Mort Artu*. The last pages, 407-409, were, of course, written for the express purpose of uniting the *Lancelot* with the *Queste*, which comes immediately after it in the series. Here (pp. 407 f.) Galahad is put into the convent (remaining there until he is eighteen years old) where he is found by Lancelot at the beginning of the *Queste*, VI, 4. It is to be observed, however, that the end of the *Lancelot* and the beginning of the *Queste* are, after all, very imperfectly harmonized; for at the beginning of the latter, VI, 3 f., Lancelot knows nothing of the nunnery where Galahad has been brought up and a messenger from it evidently puzzles him. Accordingly, on his arrival at this nunnery (p. 4) he does not recognize his son, Galahad, at all, and the presence of Bohort and Lionel there surprises him. Contrast with this the account of Galahad's bringing up at this convent (of which Pelles's sister in the *Lancelot*, though not in the *Queste*, is said to be the head) at the end of the *Lancelot*, which, as must be remembered, is not separated even by a single folio from the beginning of the *Queste* in the MSS., that unite the two branches. Here (p. 408) it is said that Lancelot, Hector, Bohort and Lionel all frequently visited Galahad in the nunnery. Now, it is impossible that such flatly contradictory passages should be from the same hand, and yet the story of Galahad's conception and bringing up must have been told in some form or other in the primitive *Queste*, before it was adjusted to the *Lancelot*, and, more especially, before the elaborate account of that hero's conception had been interpolated in the

was the first incident in what is now *La Mort Le Roi Artu* before its separation from Part III, by the intercalation of the Galahad-Quest." For a refutation of the view of the origin of the *Mort Artu* here involved, apart from the present article, I will refer the reader to my previous articles in the *ROMANIC REVIEW*, viz., "Arthuriana," III, 173 ff. (1912), and "The Development of the Mort Arthur Theme in Mediæval Romance," IV, 403 ff. (1913).

Lancelot, V, 105 ff. Consequently, the beginning of the *Queste*, as we have it, must represent a modification of the original *Queste* in respect to these matters. It is natural to suppose that the author of V, 105 ff., would modify the beginning of the *Queste*, as far as was necessary, to make it agree with his story of the begetting of the Grail Winner, when he inserted this story in the *Lancelot*, and, consequently, that the beginning of the *Queste*, as we have it in the extant MSS., was due to him.¹⁵⁰ If so, it seems evident, in view of the contradictions just noted, that V, 407-409, is not from his pen, but is the production of some later and inferior writer—probably identical with the author of the preceding pages, 377-407—who undertook to supplant an earlier and more harmonious adjustment of the *Lancelot* to the *Queste* at this point by the passage which we have before us. That he should have bungled the matter to such a degree is due, most likely, to the fact that he did not have a copy of the *Queste* present at the time and so relied upon his defective recollection of that branch. The gross inconsistencies, thus left standing in our MSS., demonstrate once more the carelessness and *insouciance* with which the redactors and *assembleurs* of the Vulgate cycle did their work.

For the rest, V, 377-409, is made up mainly of exploitations of *motifs* that had already done service in earlier divisions of the *Lancelot*: (1) pp. 378 ff., Lancelot, again deceived by Brisane, cohabits a second time with Pelles's daughter. Cf. V, 105 ff. (2) 381 ff., 393 ff., on Guinevere's account (after discovering the true nature of his act), he goes mad. Cf. III, 414 ff. (3) Perceval and Hector, not being aware of each other's identity, engage in combat. Cf. I, 279 ff., and innumerable other passages. (4) Pp. 400 ff., Lancelot again visits Corbenic, and, among other things,

¹⁵⁰ The facts brought out in my discussion of V, 105 ff., in the section on References, show that that episode (conception of Galahad) was not by the author of the *Queste*; but the person who wrote it may have modified the beginning of the *Queste* so as to make it read as we now find it in the MSS. There is nothing in the one that contradicts the other. This writer, however, though he must have discarded (in part, at least) the account of Galahad's bringing up which stood in the primitive *Queste*, must also have put something in its place; but whatever he may have inserted in the *Lancelot* on the subject was supplanted, as I have said above, by the author of pp. 407-409.

I take occasion to say here that I believe now that the *Queste* underwent greater changes than I assumed in the ROMANIC REVIEW, IV, 460, note 92.

sees the Grail there a second time. Cf. V, 105 ff. (5) Pp. 402 ff., Lancelot is taken to the Ille de Joie to recover. Cf. I, 399 ff. (Ille Perdue).

Lancelot's second cohabitation with Pelles's daughter, pp. 378 ff., it may be remarked, is contrary to the whole spirit of the story of the conception of Galahad, and brings to naught the splendid parody on the conception of Christ, which, as I have said above, was plainly the intention of that story.

Altogether V, 377-409, constitutes one of the weakest parts of the *Lancelot*, and with it our romance, which had been so long in process of evolution, expires, as it were, of inanition.

To sum up the main conclusions of this article as to the development of the *Lancelot*,¹⁵¹ I would repeat that, in my opinion, the *Lancelot* in its original form embraced merely the story of the hero's birth, his bringing up by the Lady of the Lake, his early experiences at Arthur's court and achievements connected therewith, his love-affair with Guinevere and his friendship for Galehaut, together with the three assemblies which lead up to that friendship, and the intrigue between Galehaut and the Lady of Malehaut, which is parallel to that of Lancelot and Guinevere—still further, the subsequent adventures of Lancelot and Gawain down to Galehaut's death, IV, 155.

Within this so-called *Galehaut* section (from the beginning of the romance down to IV, 155) the first considerable expansions, in order of time, were doubtless Merlin's *enserrement*, III, 19-21, and the False Guinevere episode, IV, 10-81. The episode of Claudas's wars with his barons, III, 47-105, is also a later expansion, but, owing to its connection with Lionel and Bohort, who, as it would seem, did not figure in the earliest form of the *Lancelot*, must have been of still later introduction.

¹⁵¹ The extant version of the childhood of Lionel and Bohort which (according to my theory) was substituted for a much briefer earlier version would be a case of expansion backwards. Otherwise, if my results are correct, the expansion (with the exception, of course, of the briefer interpolations) was almost exclusively forwards. These were the views which I expressed, also, in the *ROMANIC REVIEW*, IV, 465 (1913). A more thorough study of the *Lancelot*, however, has convinced me that the recasting of older materials which these expansions rendered necessary was greater than I was at that time inclined to believe.

The episodes concerning Hector in the *Lancelot* are probably of even later origin than those concerning Bohort, so that we are justified, I believe, in counting, too, among the expansions, the adventures of this character in the *Galehaut* section. They run through the greater part of III, 277-357, 388-407, being interwoven with the adventures of Lancelot and Gawain.

Besides these expansions, we should include as still later additions the passages discussed above under the head of References.

Even if we subtract all the hypothetical expansions and interpolations just mentioned from our actual text of the *Galehaut*, however, we should still have a romance of approximately 350 big quarto pages (Sommer's edition), which seems too large for a work that was composed when French prose was hardly out of its swaddling-bands. Consequently, one may safely assume, I believe, that some of the episodes which remain even after the above subtraction represent still other expansions. This may be true even of certain of the episodes in which Gawain and Lancelot are the capital figures, *e, g.*, Gawain's imprisonment by the giant, Carados, IV, 88 and 113 ff., or Lancelot's undoing of the spell of the Val Sans Retour, IV, 116 ff. Specific evidence, however, to decide such questions is lacking.

To the *Galehaut* in its original form was added next, I believe, the part of the narrative which is covered by IV, 155-321, minus the Bohort episodes and the interpolations discussed above in the section on References. These pages embrace, *inter alia*, of course, the prose rendering of Chrétien's *Lancelot* and have been, accordingly, termed the *Charete* section in this article.

At this stage of the evolution of the *Lancelot*, in my opinion, the characters of Bohort and Lionel were introduced (including, of course, the story of their father, the elder Bohort). The account, however, of the childhood of the two princes which the author of the earlier (in date) Bohort episodes of the *Charete* section must, at the same time, have inserted in the beginning of the *Lancelot* has been supplanted in our extant MSS. by a new version, in which III, 87-105, in particular, probably owes not a great deal to the older version. Not all of the Bohort episodes in IV, 155-321, are from the same pen. This hero's affair with Brangoire's

daughter, IV, 267 ff., is a later insertion (based on the story of Galahad's conception, V, 105 ff.), and, doubtless, from the same hand as the episodes which recount his visits to Corbenic, V, 139 ff., 294 ff., to say nothing of the wars of Arthur and Lancelot against Claudas, V, 321 ff.

It was after the expansion of our romance with the earliest set of episodes concerning Lionel and Bohort that the character of Hector was created and both the *Galehaut* and *Charete* sections were expanded with his adventures.

With IV, 321, begins, I believe, a new expansion (or extension) of the *Lancelot*—in the form of a quest for Lancelot by Gawain and other knights. It does not end until V, 318 (Lancelot's return to court). Even in the first instance it was conceived on a larger scale than any previous quest for Lancelot, but the original narrative (IV, 321–V, 318) has been subjected to redaction and expansion, perhaps, beyond any other part of the *Lancelot*, the loose quest form inviting, as it were, changes and additions of all kinds. Late insertions in this part of our romance are the important passages which I have considered above in the section on References—especially the passages V, 58 ff., 166 ff., 215 ff., 284 f., which I have assigned to the author of the *Mort Artu*, and the still later passages, in my opinion, of Gawain's (IV, 339 ff.), Lancelot's (V, 105 ff.), and Bohort's (V, 139 ff., 294 ff.) visits to Corbenic—composed in the order here indicated and after the *Mort Artu* (as well as the *Queste*) was already in existence. Perhaps latest of all among the expansions of this Lancelot quest are the interpolations, V, 243 ff. (Lancelot's adventures at his grandfather's tomb), and 249, 277 ff. (he sees the mystic stag and lions in the forest).

Next was added the story of the wars between Claudas, on the one hand, and Arthur and Lancelot, on the other, viz., V, 321–377, with the preparatory passage, V, 256–263. The whole was suggested, it would seem, by the *Mort Artu*, and is very likely by the same hand as the later Bohort adventures (affair with Brangoire's daughter, visits to Corbenic, etc.).

The concluding section of the romance, V, 377–409, is probably by still another author, who had before him virtually the entire *Lancelot* down to V, 377, in the same form in which it has been preserved to us in our MSS.

According to this analysis, then, the whole of V, 321-409, apart from the earlier interpolated passages, which I have indicated, was written after the *Mort Artu*.

Finally we have to consider certain scattered interpolations of less extent than those which I have thus far mentioned in this summary. A glance over the table of references which I have given above will show what they are. They are all, in my opinion, relatively late insertions. In some cases—as when a brief perfunctory reference is made to a character in some other member of the cycle, such as Joseph of Arimathea (*Estoire*) or Galahad (*Queste*)—we have, no doubt, the insertions of *assembleurs* or redactors of the cycle. There are certain interpolations, however, among this number (apart from those already mentioned in the present summary) that are not so brief. Much the most numerous of these are the interpolations that refer to the *Estoire del Saint Graal*. They run all through the *Lancelot*, as the above table of references shows, and it seems reasonable to suppose that the majority of them were the work of the same person, who aimed at uniting the *Lancelot* with the *Estoire* (and sometimes with the *Queste*). This is true, I take it, of III, 3, 13, 88, which all relate to Lancelot's genealogy and are in harmony on this subject. The same hand probably added III, 140 (monastery founded by Leucan, nephew of Joseph of Arimathea), IV, 174 ff. (Lancelot's adventures at the tombs of the elder Galahad and Symeu), and the passages, IV, 321 f., 324 ff., which are reproduced bodily from the *Estoire*—only with somewhat abbreviated text—also V, 231 ff. (Heliser and the abbey of La Petite Ausmosne), 243 ff. (Lancelot's adventures at his grandfather's tomb), 249, 277 ff. (Lancelot's mystic vision of the stag and lions and the interpretation of the same).¹⁵² It would appear, moreover, from the facts brought out at the end of my discussion of V, 243 ff., that this interpolator also expanded the *Estoire*, adding, at least, the final incident of that branch (lions and

¹⁵² III, 199 f., 215 ff. (Arthur's dreams and their interpretation) constitute an interpolation of considerable length, and the author seems to have known the *Estoire*, but they have not the purpose of the interpolations just listed—viz., to connect that branch with the *Lancelot*.—The Brumant episode, V, 318 ff., may be also by our interpolator, but, as I have said above, I think it is more likely by the author of Claudas's last wars.

the bleeding tomb).—The distribution of these interpolations seems to show that they were first made after the *Lancelot* had been extended to V, 318.

The isolated interpolations from the *Perlesvaus* and *Merlin* continuations were, doubtless, still later.

Another important conclusion to be drawn from the above analysis of the *Lancelot* seems to be that only a small part of the additions by which the original romance has been expanded to its final enormous bulk were cyclic in aim. If we leave aside a few bare references to other branches, we can ascribe such a purpose only to the interpolations, V, 105 ff. (Lancelot begets Galahad), 215 ff. (Lancelot, imprisoned by Morgan, paints the pictures which later reveal to Arthur his intrigue with Guinevere), 284 f. (the hermit tells Mordred of his incestuous birth and of the evil he is destined to cause), and to the interpolations, just named, which connect the *Lancelot* with the *Estoire*.¹⁵³ There are other passages that are cyclic in *effect*, though not in *aim*, as my comment on the passages in question, I trust, has shown. This is true even of such episodes as Gawain's visit to Corbenic, IV, 339 ff., and Bohort's two visits to the same place, V, 139 ff., 294 ff. The writers in these cases were simply exploiting other branches of the cycle for their expansions, just as they exploited Chrétien's poems, *Meraugis de Portlesgues* (it would seem), and, no doubt, many a lost metrical romance. After all, however, the larger portion of the accretions which our romance received in the course of its evolution cannot be termed cyclic in any sense.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³ V, 105 ff., has no meaning without the *Queste*, nor V, 215 ff., 284 f., without the *Mort Artu*. They were inserted obviously to unite the respective branches. In the case of the interpolations which link the *Lancelot* with the *Estoire* (and in some instances the *Queste*, too), the union is not so intimate as this, except in the case of V, 243 ff., but, nevertheless, the cyclic object is manifestly present.

¹⁵⁴ It is not necessary to assume that the additions invariably originated with scribes, at various stages, or with the men who assembled or redacted the cycle, as a whole. Other people, doubtless, took a hand in these expansions. Even a lord or a lady who had read or had heard read the *Lancelot* in an earlier form might feel moved to make suggestions, as Marie de Champagne did to Chrétien in the composition of his *Lancelot*. The essential thing to observe, however, is this: Nowadays, a person who, from the reading of fiction, might be inspired to try something in the same vein, would write a separate

short story or novel and send it to a magazine. In the twelfth or thirteenth century such a person—especially if he were writing in prose—would frequently find satisfactory expression for his inspiration in attaching his inventions to the romance which had stimulated him to the act of composition and in making the old characters the heroes and heroines of the episodes which he might add. Thus, his work would simply go to swell the bulk of a previously existing romance.

The whole article above implies a refutation of the MS. ascriptions of the *Lancelot* to Walter Map. We have no means of judging why these ascriptions were made. Map, however, was one of the leading men of the age and of Welsh origin, and it may be that on that account some scribe or redactor, or possibly even the author of some part of the romance, endeavored to win the prestige of his name for these pseudo-Celtic stories.

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

SOME THEORIES OF IRISH LITERARY INFLUENCE AND THE LAY OF YONEC

ALTHOUGH it is universally recognized that there is in the so-called Breton Lays and in the early French chivalric romances a mass of material which has been derived from oriental and classical sources, this fact and the important problems to which it gives rise receive scant attention from those scholars who maintain that the primary source of these early French poems is to be found in Irish literature. The fact they recognize, of course, and whenever the appearance of this extraneous matter in a French poem, which in their opinion is certainly Irish in substance, would seem to run counter to their theory, they explain the presence of this non-Irish matter on the ground that it has been substituted by the French poet for matter in his Irish source which he did not understand; or else, that it had been amalgamated with Irish matter on Irish soil, put into literary form, and then passed on to the continent. When Professor Brown, for example, argues¹ for an origin of the Welsh *Owain* independent of the French version of Chrétien, he is bothered by the appearance in both versions of a magic ring, since the difference in the handling of the ring episodes forms one of the supports of his thesis. Because magic rings do not occur in early Irish literature, the logical method would seem to demand that he look elsewhere for examples of a magic ring employed as the ring is employed in the Ivain story; he would not, of course, have had to search far, as there are many examples in tales which are certainly not Irish in origin and which Chrétien must have known, the Salomon and Morolf story, for instance. Professor Brown is sure, however, that the Welsh *Owain* is derived directly from a Brythonic *märchen* worked up into literary form, and he suggests, therefore, that the magic ring which in Chrétien's version, Laudine gives to Ivain, has been substituted for the magic branch which in the Irish *Imram Brain* is a talisman which admits the bearer to the other world; hence in the original version of the

¹ ROMANIC REVIEW, III, 1912, 143 sq.

Ivain story, the ring must have been such a talisman. He discovers the evidence of this original function in "the way in which Ivain finds himself powerless to restrain Lunete from taking away his ring when she comes for it" (*Ivain*, 2704 sq.), an episode to which he finds "a striking parallel in the behavior of the magic branch" in the *Voyage of Bran* (I, 16); here the fairy lady takes the magic branch from Bran: "the branch sprang from Bran's hand into the hand of the woman, nor was there strength in Bran's hand to hold the branch." It makes no difference, of course, that there is not the slightest similarity between the two episodes, that there is no hint, either in the French or the Welsh versions of *Ivain*, that the ring was a magic talisman "endowing its owner with the marvellous power of penetrating to the other world"; that Laudine expressly tells Ivain when she presents him with the ring that it will protect him from sickness and imprisonment, the only actual hindrances which, he has said, will prevent him from returning to her; that, when he does not return as he has pledged himself to do, and when Lunete, in the name of her mistress demands the ring, he makes no effort to retain it, as, it would seem, Bran did do in the case of the magic branch; it makes no difference that there are countless tales, certainly not Irish, in which appears a magic ring possessing exactly the properties ascribed to this ring, notably, for example, the ring in *Floire et Blancheflor*. Moreover, since the ring as a protective talisman or love pledge, occurs in both the French and Welsh versions (the latter omits it at the parting scene but retains it in the scene where Luned denounces Owain, p. 187, II, 31) it must have had a place in the source, *x*, which, according to Professor Brown's hypothesis, was the original of both the French and Welsh versions. This source "was not pure Welsh" but it certainly must have been put into literary form by some one familiar with Irish and Welsh literature and traditions, especially with Irish stories dealing with the other world, since the Welsh version contains "a great number of primitive details" which, he maintains, must have come from such tales. It is difficult to see, however, why the author of *x* should have substituted for the magic branch, which must have been entirely familiar to him from its occurrence in other world stories which he knew well, the magic

ring which not only has no place in such stories but no place in Irish literature.

In a similar fashion Professor Cross explains² features in the *Lay of Yonec* which he cannot find in those Irish tales which he argues furnished the material for the poem. He shows that the belief that supernatural beings could have intercourse with mortal women was common among the ancient Irish, as also was the belief that such beings appeared in the form of birds. These facts, however, do not prove that these ideas came to Marie or to her source from Irish tales, since there were accessible to the author of *Yonec* a host of tales, certainly not Irish, based upon these same ideas. "The sons of God came unto the daughters of men," says the author of *Genesis*, VI, 3, and this belief is echoed more than once in Holy Writ, in lives of the Saints, in the exempla of preachers. And there is Ovid telling again and again how supernatural beings visit mortals either in the form of mortals or in the form of animals and birds. Jupiter takes on the form of a woman and appears as the huntress Diana when he rapes Callisto (*M.*, II, 425); Mercury, flying idly through the air, beholds Herse the beautiful and loves her; "vertit iter, caeloque petit terrena relict," and in human form, a regular *cultus adulter*, enjoys her; her sister discovers the secret and tries to prevent his visits; he turns her into stone and "terras linquit et ingreditur iactatis aethera pennis" (*M.*, II, 708 sq.); Jupiter takes on the form of a bull, carries off Europa across the sea, and then lays aside his disguise and "se confessus est" (*M.*, II, 845 sq.); he becomes a swan and begets from Leda the fair Helen (*Her.*, XVI, 41 sq.); Juno takes the form of Beroë, the old nurse of Semele, and urges her, on the ground that "multi nomine divorum thalamos iniere pudicos" (*M.*, III, 28), to demand proof of the divine character of the lover who comes to visit her, and the god then descends as god. Then again there are the stories which certainly come from oriental sources; the story of the wizard Nectanebus and his union with the mother of Alexander in the various versions of the Alexander romance; the story of the devil who usurped the form and throne of Solomon; the story of that same devil, now an angel, in the famous tale of the Emperor

² "The Celtic Origin of the *Lay of Yonec*," University of North Carolina, *Studies in Philology*, 1913, pp. 26 sq.

Jovinian in which the angel takes the place of the emperor and is received by the Queen as her husband whether or not he plays the husband's part. Why, therefore, is it necessary to cite as evidence of the Irish character of *Yonec*, a tale from the *Book of Fermoy*, fifteenth century, in which the god Manannán mac Lir assumes the form of King Fiachna Lurga and with the latter's permission visits his wife; the lover in *Yonec* or in such tales as those just cited does not ask such permission. Or why cite, as a parallel to the change of sex of the lover in *Yonec*, a passage from the fourteenth century *Book of Ballymote* in which a messenger from Mannannán takes on the form of a woman in order to visit Tuag, daughter of Conall, and carries her off? Even granting that this passage occurred in the original version of the *Dinnshenchus*, a fact which is by no means proved since such a detail might easily have been added during the course of the centuries, what has this in common with the situation in *Yonec*? We are not told in the earliest version of the Irish tale that Tuag was kept "apart from men"; these words are found only in a sixteenth century manuscript, and the messenger does not become a bird in order to gain access to the maiden, but a woman, just as Jupiter does in the Callisto story. There is certainly no parallel here to the bird-lover Muldumarec, who as a bird gains access to the wife imprisoned in the tower, and who takes on the form of a woman merely in order to receive the sacrament from the hands of a priest. Under the circumstances what other form, pray, could he have assumed?

As far, then, as the appearance of supernatural beings to mortals goes and their assumption either of the form of mortals or of birds, these features of *Yonec* were certainly known to the author of the poem from many sources equally accessible and well known as any possible Irish source.

This statement is eminently true, also, of the inclusa-motif which is not in harmony with early Irish customs and is generally admitted to be oriental, although it is common, also, in classical stories. This feature, therefore, Professor Cross concedes is not Irish, but, in order to establish a point of contact between this non-Irish motif and Irish tradition, he considers it worthy of note that in some Irish tales maidens (not wives) are kept apart from men and visited by supernatural lovers in the form of birds. He cites,

as proof of this, the story of Tuag, to which I have referred, and describes it, p. 48, as "representing the woman as being kept in an isolated dwelling," and as "being brought up apart from men," by which males are meant. Is this, however, a fair statement of the case? The version in the fourteenth century manuscript tells us simply, "she was reared in Tara with a great host of Eriu's kings' daughters about her to protect her," and only in a sixteenth century manuscript do the words "apart from men" occur. In the earlier version, at least, I fail to see any hint of "an isolated dwelling." His other example is the story of Mess Mucchalla, the daughter of King Cormac whom either he or the stepmother of the child,—the matter is doubtful as we shall see,—orders to be slain. The babe is given to two thralls of the king who, however, feel pity for her and, according to the version in the *Yellow Book of Lecan*, fourteenth century,³ they hand her over to a cowherd of Eterskel, king of Tara, by whom she is brought up. This cowherd, from fear of discovery, keeps the child in a house of wickerwork having an opening in the roof only, and through this opening enters the supernatural lover in the form of a bird, casts off its plumage and enjoys the maiden; from the union was born Conaire the Great, whose birth and name the lover announces before his departure. This episode occurs only in the *Yellow Book* and later MSS., but, it is argued, it may go back to the ninth or tenth century, (1) because the saga,—not this episode,—the *Togail Bruidhe Dá Derga*, in which this episode is found in the *Yellow Book*, is mentioned in the *Book of Leinster* (1150); (2) because the death,—not the birth,—of Conaire is referred to in the version of the *Serglige Conchulainn*, contained in the *Lebor na h'Uidre* (1106); (3) because the *LU* version of the saga, which deals with the death of Conaire, not his birth, describes this death in language very similar to that in the version contained in the *Yellow Book*; (4) because the *LU* version may have been written down in the ninth or tenth century. The point at issue, however, is, not whether this saga, which tells of the fight at Dá Derga's Hostel and the death of Conaire, is ancient, no one doubts this, but whether the bird-lover and the birth of Conaire had a place in the early versions of the

³ Cf. Stokes, *Revue Celtique*, XXII, 1901, pp. 9, and following, for text and translation.

saga. It is difficult to see why this fact *must* follow from the evidence, or why the *LU*, if it did contain a version of Conaire's birth, *must* have contained essentially the same version as that in the *Yellow Book of Lecan* three centuries later. It should be borne in mind that there are decided differences in regard to details and episodes between the older and later versions of a given Irish tale. There are interpolations even in the *Lebor na h'Uidre*,⁴ and when we compare the versions of any story contained in the later paper manuscripts with versions of the same story contained in the old vellum manuscripts, which often give merely the substance of old tales, we see that bards were perfectly free to change, to embellish, to amplify traditional matter. That such changes, embellishments, and amplifications were due in many cases to borrowing from non-Irish sources,—Irish bards were great travellers,—is perfectly clear from the different versions of the famous story of Deidre, for example, as they are recorded in the *Book of Leinster* (1150) and in the late Belfast MS. translated by Hyde, *Literary Hist. of Ireland*, p. 304; this latter version he describes as "an admirable example of the later extension and embellishment of the ancient texts."⁵

It is, however, another Irish tale which Professor Cross considers to be the closest parallel to the first part of Marie's *Yonect*, and which represents, in his opinion, more or less closely the form of the story which Marie or her source knew and utilized. This is the *Snám Da Én* which is found in the *Book of Leinster* (1150) and which he ably edits and translates on pp. 40 sq. of his study. King Nar has a beautiful wife, Estiu, a woman-warrior; two brothers, in bird form, Luan and Bude, visit Estiu; they enchant the host by their songs, and when all are fast asleep, they appear in their proper shapes and Bude shares Estiu's bed. The king asks his Druid whence these birds come and after the Druid discloses their identity the king goes to the ford whither the two birds come,

⁴ Cf. Best, *Eriu*, VI, 1912, 161 sq.

⁵ Cf. Miss Hull, *Folk-Lore*, XV, 1904, p. 25. To a layman it seems that the words "apart from men" which occur only in the sixteenth century version of the story of Tuag, cited above, may have been due to the influence of this story of Deidre, of whom it is said, in the LL version, "Deidre was brought up in Conor's house.—She was reared in a house apart; no man was allowed to see her until she should become Conor's wife." How different all this is from the jealous old husband and his pretty wife of the *Yonect*!

as was their custom, to meet Estiu; he kills them both; the queen flees, but apparently dies soon after, and "the king dies of grief for his wife." "In their broader outlines," says Professor Cross, "the two stories (the Irish tale and *Yonec*) are almost identical," and a "more detailed examination reveals other resemblances"; these he draws up as follows: both husbands are of high position (granted, but is this detail peculiarly Irish?). The Irish king, like the husband in *Yonec*, is jealous; there is not a hint of this in the Irish tale, and Cross apparently infers it from the fact that he slays his wife's lovers. Granting the propriety of the inference, he certainly did not shut his wife up in a tower and place over her a companion "pur lui tenir en justice." The wife in both stories is of great beauty and is willing to have a lover; granted, but is this detail peculiar to this Irish tale? As the lady in *Yonec* receives her lover in the tower, so Estiu sometimes apparently received her lovers in her husband's house. But where is there the slightest parallel between the situations in the two stories? In *Yonec* there is one bird-man, in the Irish two; in the former the lover flies to his lonely lady shut up in her tower, in the latter, the two bird-lovers enchant the host by their songs and then one shares the lady's bed; where this is we are not told but it is certainly not in a place apart. "The catastrophe is due to the discovery of the lady and her lover together." This is not the whole truth; in *Yonec*, the old husband becomes suspicious of the happy demeanor of his wife, bids his sister hide in her room, and she discovers the truth; then makes a trap to catch the bird; in the Irish tale the king, when he learns from his Druid the real nature of the birds, goes to the trysting place and slays both the visitors with his spear. The lovers' dwelling is within a hill; we are not told so in the Irish tale but infer it from the statement that the two youths come "from the hillocks of Dubthir," and from the fact that "so many Celtic other world beings resided in the green mounds of Ireland." The inference may be justified, but neither of the two reaches his abode again, wherever it may have been, whereas Muldumarec does reach his and is followed thither by the lady. In both stories the visits are of frequent occurrence; yes, but in *Yonec* the lover comes at the wish of the lady, in the Irish, the brothers come whenever they desire. The person who discloses the lover's existence is a dependent of the

husband; this again, is not the whole truth; in the Irish the king asks his Druid to explain the presence of the birds, since the Druid, as a magician, would know about such things; the Druid is not the watchman whom he has placed over his wife to guard her virtue, whereas in the *Yonéc* this is exactly what the old lady, the husband's sister, is, a common figure not only in oriental and classical erotic tales, but in real life. Why suppose, then, that the Irish tale was the original and that the Druid was replaced by the duenna? The two stories, therefore, far from being approximately identical are totally unlike, except in the fact that both deal with the visit of a supernatural lover in bird form to a mortal woman, and this motif, we have seen, is common in non-Irish tales which the author of *Yonéc* certainly knew.

For the other details in *Yonéc* also, Professor Cross finds evidences of Irish provenience. The magic ring which the lover gives the lady to protect her against the righteous wrath of her husband he recognizes, of course, is not Irish, but he does find two Irish stories, the *Cath Maige Turedh*, in a fifteenth century manuscript, and the *Aidead Ainfir Aife* in the *Yellow Book of Lecan*, in which a ring appears, not, be it noted, a magic ring, but simply the usual recognition token common in this type of tale, both oriental and Greek as well as Irish. In the former story a ring is given to Queen Eri by her lover, king of the Fomorians, with the injunction that she "must not part with it save to one whose finger it will fit." In due time a son, Bress, is born, and is made king, but he is deposed, and goes to his mother for advice; she finds that the ring fits his finger, and accompanies him to his father. In the latter story, Cuchulinn, a mortal, visits the kingdom of Scatha, ravishes the amazon Aife and, on leaving her, gives her, according to the version preserved in the *Yellow Book*, a ring, telling her that when it fits the child's finger, he must be sent to Ireland to seek his father. To pass over the fact that this ring episode does not have a place in what seems to be the oldest version of the *Cuchulinn-Aife* story, that preserved in the Rawlinson vellum MS., what parallel is there between the use made of the ring in the two Irish stories and in *Yonéc*? In the one case it is a recognition token, in the other a magic, protective talisman. Again, in *Yonéc*, the lover, after he has been caught in the trap and mortally wounded, tells the lady

that she will bear him a son who will be famous and that he will be called Yonec. These two features, the prediction of the birth of a boy and the bestowal of a name, are found in some Irish tales, but only in late versions, and in some cases there are earlier versions which omit these details. In the *Compert Mongain*, for example, referred to above (p. 126), according to the version contained in the fifteenth century *Book of Fermoy*, Manannán tells Lurga's wife that she will bring forth a son who shall be called Mongan and shall be famous. It will be noticed that, although Professor Cross states that the earliest version of the *Compert Mongain* is found in the *Lebor na h'Uidre*, he does not cite this MS. as his authority for this episode, simply because, one may suppose, this episode is not in this MS., nor does he tell us that in another very early version of the birth of Mongan, that contained in the versified portions of the *Voyage of Bran*,⁶ the detail of the bestowal of the name has no place; here the god appears to Lurga and foretells the glory of the son that will be born from his union with Lurga's wife: "A glorious child shall be begotten by me there and from thee shall he be named—and I shall go in thy shape."⁶ His second example is the *Togail Bruidhe Dá Derga* (fourteenth century *Book of Lecan*), where the bird lover, after he has had his way with Mess Bua-challa, tells her before he departs that she will bear a son who shall be called Conaire. And again, in the *Cath Maige Turedh* (fif-

* Cf. Nutt, *Voyage of Bran*, I, App. 52. One loses patience, indeed, with such arguments which are often, as in this case, so expressed as to mislead entirely the trustful reader. A similar instance is found on p. 31, n. 15; Professor Cross refers to Miss Rickert's comparison of *Yonec* to the Mabinogi of Pwyll, Prince of Dyved, "in which a mortal is transformed by a supernatural being into the latter's semblance, and thus gains access to his wife." One would conclude from this statement that there was really some similarity between the two stories, that both dealt with the union of a disguised supernatural being with the wife of a mortal, as in *Yonec*, and that the purpose of the disguise was to effect this union. Nothing, however, could be further from the truth. In the Welsh story Pwyll, while out hunting, drives off the dogs of Arawn from the latter's quarry and thus offends Arawn. Pwyll offers to make amends to Arawn, and the latter, in order to prove his worth as a knight, exchanges with him shape and circumstances for a year. Pwyll proves his worth by the fact that during that time he forebears to claim the prerogatives of a husband from the other's wife. Could anything be more unlike *Yonec*? This episode in Pwyll is similar, however, to the situation in *Ami et Amile*, and derives no doubt from the same source, which seems to have been an oriental tale.

teenth century Harleian), the king of the Fomorians tells Eri that she will bring forth a wonderful son who shall be called Bress. On the other hand, in the earliest version of the *Aidead Ainfir Aife*, which Professor Cross also cites as a parallel, contained in the *Yellow Book of Lecan* (fourteenth century), the detail of the bestowal of the name is not found; he supplies it from a version of the *Tochmarc Emire* which is later than the story found in the *Yellow Book*. We are asked, that is, to accept the version of the *Cuchulinn-Aife* story contained in the *Yellow Book* as dating from the ninth or tenth century,—the matter no doubt does,—but when a detail, which is needed for an argument is lacking, we supply this from a version of another tale found in a MS. later than the *Yellow Book*, and then proceed, as though the point were proved: “in all three tales (Cath Maige Turedth, *Aidead Ainfir Aife*, *Yonac*), a being from another world bestows his attentions upon a woman whom, on his departure, he leaves pregnant. He predicts that a son will be born—and at the same time gives the boy a name” (p. 57). It is to be noted, moreover, that the *Cuchulinn-Aife* story, at least, very certainly underwent changes in regard to these very details; the ring episode is not found in the Rawlinson MS., whereas in a late version of the story, quoted by Hyde, *op. cit.*, p. 300, Cuchulinn tells Aife that if the child turns out to be a girl she must keep it by her, if a boy, he is to be sent to seek his father,—an expression of a very natural doubt, since Cuchulinn as a mortal, without the immortal’s foreknowledge, had no way of knowing the sex of the child before its birth. In view, therefore, of the late date of the stories containing these features, and of the divergences in the different versions of the *Compert Mongain* and the *Cuchulinn-Aife* story, why *must* it follow that the prophecy of a son and the bestowal of a name had a place in the versions of these stories current before the *Yonac* was written? Here again the question is not whether the matter of those stories was current before Marie, but whether these minor details which we find in versions two or three hundred years later than Marie, but which are in some cases lacking in the earliest versions, formed part of this original matter. As far as the bestowal of the name goes it may be noted that this detail does not appear in our earliest western versions of the type of tale,—*Sohrab and Rustem*,—to which the *Aidead Ainfir Aife*,

the earliest of the stories concerned, certainly belongs. It is absent, for example, from the Hildebrand story which De Jubainville thought came from the same Celtic lay that furnished the matter for the story of Cuchulinn and his son. In regard to the prophecy of a son, however, there are a large number of stories, certainly not Celtic, many of which were well-known in the twelfth century, in which the father merely assumes that the child will be a boy and on his departure leaves as recognition token a man's weapon, usually a sword; so, for example, in the Aegeus-Theseus story, Ovid, *M.*, VII, 404 sq. The direct prophecy, on the other hand, is found in versions of the Alexander romance,⁷ where the wily Nectanebus tells the Queen that the god Ammon,—whom he is to impersonate,—will visit her and that she will bear a son who will be famous throughout the world.

In view of these facts, therefore, it seems rather hazardous, to say the least, to conclude that the bestowal of the name in these Irish stories is anything else than the MS. tradition would seem to show, a later detail incorporated into the familiar story of a son born from an unknown father. There was, moreover, accessible to the author of *Yonac* a large number of stories which he or she, a devout(?) Christian as the episode of the sacrament shows, must have known, stories which contain the bestowal of the name in connection with the prophecy of the birth of a wonderful child; I refer to Bible stories and Lives of the Saints. Compare inter alia the announcement to Jacob of Isaac's birth, *Gen.*, XVII, 18, the prophecy of the angel Gabriel to Mary in *Luke*, I, 30 sq., and especially the elaboration of this episode in the apocryphal Gospels;⁸ *Protevangelium Jacobi*, XI; *Pseudo-Matt.*, IX: here Mary, a girl of fourteen, has vowed to remain a virgin; she is given to Joseph, an old man, and five other maidens go with her to his home to attend and protect her; the angel appears to her first while she is at the well and again as she sits in her room during the absence of Joseph

⁷ So in the *de Preliis* and in Thomas of Kent, *Roman de toute Chealerie*; cf. Meyer, *Le Roman d'Alexandre, Bibliothèques française du Moyen Age*, vol. IV, pp. 195 sq. The idea, as my colleague, Professor Bassett, reminds me, is as old as Homer, at least; cf. *Od.* XI, 240 sq., where Poseidon appears to Tyro, prophesizes the birth of famous children, and after the union plunges into the sea; in due time Peleas and Neleus were born.

⁸ Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrapha*.

who has been away for three months; the angel foretells the birth of a "regem qui non solum terram implet sed coelum"; he then appears to Joseph when on his return home he notices the condition of his wife and suspects that she has been unfaithful, explains the situation to him and tells him that Mary will bring forth a son who will be called Jesus; similar to this is the account in the *de Nativitate Mariae*, IX. It was inevitable that this matter should be carried over into the lives of the Saints and we read in the *Life of Euthymius* (Jan. 20), for example, that to his mother who had been barren,⁹ the martyr Polyeuctus appeared, foretold the birth of a wonderful boy, and bade him be called Euthymius. That such a transference of detail from sacred to profane writings would not be unnatural we see from the fact that in some stories, to which I shall refer below, a lover gains access to his lady by disguising himself as the angel Gabriel or even as Christ.

In regard to the other salient features of *Yonec*,—the trap by means of which the lover is caught and mortally wounded, the visit of the lady to her lover's abode, the murder of her husband by the son,—there are no parallels in Irish literature, although Professor Cross is inclined to see in the second episode a reference to the familiar Celtic account of a journey to the other world which the author of *Yonec* has rationalized. The details, however, especially the presence of the two sleeping youths, are not peculiarly Celtic,—empty cities and magnificent castles are familiar to any reader of oriental tales,—and in the account of the second journey to Muldumarec's kingdom there are wanting, as Professor Cross notes, all the characteristic features of the journey to the other world. Wherever the scene of the first visit may be laid, the second surely is on this earth. The reason for this inconsistency will appear below.

Let us see, now, what are the features which distinguish *Yonec* and do not occur in any Irish tale; (1) The jealous husband who shuts his wife up in a tower; (2) the female companion of the lady, set over her by her husband to guard her chastity; (3) the

⁹ This detail is common in the so-called Kinder-Wunsch stories and appears in versions of *Robert the Devil*; cf. Breul, *Sir Gowther, Eine Englische Romanse aus dem XVten Jahrhundert*, Oppeln, 1886. I shall have more to say about this matter in another place. For the life of St. Euthymius, by Cyrillus of Scythopolis, cf. Migne, *Patr. Graec.* cxiv, col. 583 sq.; Surius, *Vita Sancti*, I, p. 319.

appearance of the lover at the wish of the lady; (4) the proof of his benign character by partaking of the sacrament, for which purpose he changes himself into a woman; (5) the trap and the wounding of the lover; (6) the visit by the lady to his home; (7) the ring which will protect her against her husband; (8) the sword which she is to give to her son; (9) the revenge of the lover whose son kills the lady's husband. These details are, I think it will be admitted, essential to the poem. What, on the other hand, are the features which *Yonac* shares with Irish tales independent of the question of date? (1) A supernatural lover; (2) his appearance in bird form; (3) prediction of the sex of the child, and (4) the bestowal of his name.

There is, then, absolutely no evidence that there was prior to Marie any Celtic tale which contained any one of the nine features of the first group, to say nothing of the combination of these features into a more or less unified whole, and there is only one Irish tale, the *Togail Bruidhe Dá Derga*, preserved in the manuscript of the fourteenth century, which contains in combination the last four. Of these four the first two in combination occur frequently in stories which are certainly not Celtic and which were as equally well-known and accessible as any possible Irish tale. The prediction of the sex of the child and the bestowal of the name cannot be proved to occur in Irish literature before the fourteenth century, but they do occur in non-Celtic matter which Marie must have known. There is, therefore, no a fortiori reason why these four details must have come from the one source rather than from the other, whereas there are the best of reasons why the other nine details must have come from non-Celtic sources: they are not found in Irish and Welsh tales and are found elsewhere.

Such a comparison of details, however, although it is suggestive and sufficient to refute the sweeping claim of the Celtic origin of *Yonac*, as far, at least, as Irish and Welsh literature furnishes evidence for such origin, is of little positive value. One would rather know whether Marie or her source simply took these divers details and combined them into a unified whole, or whether there already existed some story containing all or part of them. A very definite answer to this question is impossible owing to the scantiness of our written record, but there are, nevertheless, certain

fundamental facts which, it seems to me, point the way to a satisfactory answer.

The stories referred to above have indicated that there was accessible to a French writer of the twelfth century a large number of tales certainly not Celtic in origin in which we may distinguish two essential features. I. A woman is shut up in a tower, generally with an attendant, either by her father or her husband,—the so-called *inclusa* motif. In classical stories of this type, it is the father who imprisons his daughter and his act is sometimes explained as the result of a prophecy that the daughter will bring forth a son who will kill the father or drive him from his throne, so, for example,¹⁰ in the familiar story of Acrisius and Danaë, referred to by Ovid, *Am.*, 2, 19, 28; 3, 4, 21, and told by Horace, *Od.*, 3, 16, in which Jupiter in a shower of gold, visits Danaë imprisoned in an "aenea turris," and in a tale reported by Aelian, *de nat. an.*, XII, 21, of a Babylonian king. In the most famous example, however, the story of Hero and Leander, no motive for the father's act is given; cf. the version¹¹ of Ovid, *Epist.*, XVII, Stat. *Theb.*, VI, 542 sq., *Schol. on Stat. Silvae*, I, 2, 87. Those stories, on the other hand, in which a husband, because of jealousy, confines his wife to a tower, seem to have come from oriental sources. It may be noted, however, that the best known story of this type, and the only one I need cite, the so-called *Inclusa* in the *Seven Wise Masters*,¹² does not occur in any of the oriental versions of the romance except the Latin translation of the Hebrew *Mischle Sendabar*,¹³ whereas

¹⁰ These citations are not meant to be exhaustive, and I have selected merely a few which prove the prevalence of the type in western literature and which occur in most cases in sources accessible to French writers of the twelfth century.

¹¹ For this story in the Middle Ages, cf. Hagen, *Gesammbab.*, p. cxxviii, Bartsch, *Albrecht von Halberstadt*, p. xxxiv sq. For the motif in modern Greek tales, cf. Hahn, *Gr. u. Alb. Märchen*, No. 13.

¹² The story is found in French versions and in the Latin *Historia septem sapientum*; in the old French *Dolopathos* it is combined with the so-called *Puteus*; cf. Campbell, *The Seven Sages of Rome*, Boston, 1907, p. cix; Hilka, *Historia septem sapientum*, Heidelberg, 1913, p. xviii.

¹³ The Latin text is edited by Hilka, *op. cit.* Compare for evidence of the oriental origin of the *Inclusa*, Clouston, *The Book of Sindibad*, Glasgow, 1884, pp. 303 sq., 346 sq.

it is found in the various western versions.¹⁴ From some version of this story, it would seem, Marie drew the features of the imprisoned lady, attended by a eunuch which she uses in *Guigemar*,¹⁵ and the motif occurs in other stories¹⁶ which are certainly not Celtic. We may be sure, therefore, that Geoffrey of Monmouth, in his story of *Igern*, VIII, 19, whom her husband, the Duke of Cornwall, shuts up in a tower by the sea-shore, is not dealing with Celtic matter; the "tower by the sea" makes one think of Hero, or of the lady in the *Inclusa* story, who in the Latin *Mischle Sendabar*, was confined in a tower "in Yspania iuxta mare" (Hilka, p. 30, 17). II. A woman is secretly visited by a lover, either a mortal or a supernatural being, who gains access to her in various ways and under various disguises. No theme has been more popular than this in the stories of all peoples and I select a few examples merely to show that the Celts had no monopoly upon it. A very striking example is found in the Hebrew story of the birth of Samson, *Judges*, 13; Zorah, the wife of Manoah, was barren and longed for a child; an angel of God, in the likeness of man came unto her; and again he came "as she sat in the field" but "her husband was not with her"; the angel would not tell her his name, which was secret (vs. 18), but predicted that she would bear a son who should "begin to deliver Israel out of the hand of the Philistines"; "and the woman bare a son, and called his name Samson: and the child grew and the Lord blessed him" (vs. 24). Here we are not expressly told that the child was begotten by the angel, but of the

¹⁴ Cf. Hilka, *op. cit.*, I, p. xviii. In the *Dolopathos* of Johannis de Alta Silva, instead of *Inclusa* is found the story of the deception of the philosopher by his wife whom he has imprisoned in a tower, whence she escapes by a trick, the so-called *Puteus*.

¹⁵ Compare Miss Paton, *Studies in the Fairy Mythology of the Arthurian Romance*, p. 68; Schofield, *P. M. L. A.*, XV, p. 173.

¹⁶ Compare *Roman de Flamenca*, ed. Meyer, 1304 sq.; *Aucassin et Nicolette*, ed. Suchier, 5, 1; here the maiden is imprisoned by her foster father and is attended by an old woman. This reminds one of the situation in several Greek stories to which I shall refer below; on the other hand the harem scene in *Floire et Blancheflor*, a tale which is certainly related in some way to *Aucassin et Nicolette*, is clearly oriental; cf. on this matter, Johnston, *Matske Memorial Volume*, pp. 125 sq. To be noted, also, is *Wolfdietrich*, 4 sq. (ed. Holtzmann, pp. 4 sq.), where Hugdietrich gets into the tower where the beautiful Hildeberg is confined by disguising himself as a maiden, an episode which reminds one of the eighth story in the *Vetälâpantschavîngati*.

belief¹⁷ underlying the story there can be no doubt. We may be perfectly sure, also, that such a story as that of St. Euthymius, to which I have referred above, rests upon the belief that the barren wife owed her child to the martyred saint and not to her earthly husband. In the Greek and Roman world the supernatural being was commonly believed to approach the woman in the form of a serpent,¹⁸ as Apollo did when he begat Augustus; and similar stories are told of other great men, notably Alexander the Great.¹⁹ But they could appear in their proper persons, also, as Apollo did to Periktionē when he begat Plato and was seen by Ariston who therefore "held her clean" until the child was born,²⁰ or they could take on other forms; Jupiter visits the imprisoned Danaë in a shower of gold; he appears to Semele first as a mortal and then, to prove his divinity, as a thunderbolt (cf. above p. 125); he visits Leda in the form of a swan, Alcmene in the likeness of her husband and begets Hercules,—a popular story as Plautus' comedy shows and its mediaeval descendant, *Geta*;²¹ Apollo, in the form of a swan, begat Cynos from a mortal maid, and so on.

The god Apollo is the hero of another story which is deserving of a longer notice: Laodike, the wife of Antiochus, dreamed that she had been made pregnant by Apollo, and that the god had left with her a ring, on the stone of which was engraved an anchor, telling her to give it to the son which she should bring forth; in the morning she found the ring of her dream in her bed, and the son, when he was born, bore the mark of the seal on his thigh. This child was the famous Seleucus, and when he set forth with Alexander on his first expedition, his mother told him her secret and

¹⁷ For the persistence of the belief among the oriental Jews that barren women may bear children to "the sons of God," cf. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion Today*, New York, 1902, pp. 116 sq. The influence of this story of Zorah may be seen in the apocraphal versions of the birth of Mary; cf. the references given above, p. 133.

¹⁸ So especially Æsculapius; cf. Deubner, *de incubatione*, p. 33, n.

¹⁹ Cf. Suet., *Aug.*, 94; Livy, XXVI, 19; Gell., VI, 1; Plut., *Alexander*, 2; Tertull., *de an.* 46; Lucian, *Dial. Mort.*, XIII, 1 sq.

²⁰ Cf. Diog. Laertius, III, 2; Hieronymus, *adv. Iovinianum*, I, 42. For these and other examples, cf. Usener, *Das Weihnachtsfest*, Bonn, 1911, I, pp. 71 sq.

²¹ By Vitalis Blesensis, who drew, it would seem, not from Plautus directly but from some other version of Plautus' play; cf. for references, Reinhardt-toettner, *Plautus*, Leipzig, 1886, pp. 124 sq.

gave him the ring.²² There was, indeed, hardly a great man who, in the minds of the folk, did not come from a divine being. Herodotus, VI, 59, tells a story of the Spartan king Demaratus, who was mocked by his enemies as the child of illicit love; he goes to his mother with the question, "who is my father," and she tells him that one night as she slept there came to her the hero Astrabakos in the likeness of her husband, leaving behind him the crown which adorned the statue over his grave. In like manner the famous athlete Theagenes was the son of Hercules, who visited his mother in the likeness of her husband, Paus, 6, 11, 2. Such ideas, dear to the hearts of the folk, the Church did not hesitate to make use of to enhance the glory of a saint; witness the story of St. Euthymius, or of St. Caecilia who, in order to protect her virginity from her husband Valentinianus, tells him her secret: "angelum dei habeo amatorem qui nimio zelo custodit corpus meum." Very naturally he demands a sight of the angel, but such a boon, says Caecilia, is vouchsafed only to him who is baptized; he thereupon receives baptism, and on his return beholds Caecilia praying in her room, and an angel with flaming wings by her, holding two crowns of roses and of lillies which he places on her head and departs.²³ On the other hand it could condemn them, and picture these visitants as angels of Satan or as evil magicians. Hence arose stories such as *Robert the Devil*, and it is only by reference to some such story, I would suggest, that we can explain the curious detail in *Yonac*, which Professor Cross and others leave unexplained, of the necessity of the lover's proof of his Christian character by taking the sacrament; the lady well knew that "multi nomine divorum thalamos iniere pudicos" (Ovid, *M.*, III, 28, cf. above p. 125), and she will consent to no union with a prince of darkness.²⁴ Of the other form of this motif, that in which a mortal pays secret visits to a mortal, little need be said; the situation is only too common both in literature and real life. I would emphasize, however, those stories

²² Cf. Justinus, XV, 4, 2 sq.

²³ Cf. *Acta Sanc.*, II, p. 204, from which comes the account in *Legenda aurea*, ed. Graesse, ch. 169, p. 772.

²⁴ How closely stories of this type are connected with classical tradition is shown by the fact that the child of the fiend and the lady generally bears a birth-mark such as that which distinguished Seleucus, the son of Apollo and a mortal woman, in the story just cited.

in which the belief in the supernatural lover is used to explain the success of the mortal lover's adventure; just as gods appear to the lady in human form, so mortals disguise themselves as gods or as ministers of god. The classical example of this type of story is Boccaccio, *Decam.*, IV, 2, in which the lover disguises himself as the angel Gabriel in order to visit the lady, in Morlini, November 29, as Christ,—a tale which derives from some version of the Sanscrit tale²⁵ of "The Weaver as Vishnu."

In this story a weaver sees a princess at a festival; falls in love with her and is overcome as though he had drunk poison; he determines to possess the maiden; his friend, a carpenter, rigs him up as the god Vishnu, and makes for him the marvellous bird, Garuda, by means of which he flies to the palace of seven stories and into the room on the top story where the maiden dwelt alone. He convinces her that he is a god, that disaster will follow her refusal to be his, and thus makes her his own. The king's attendants discover the truth, and report to the king, who demands proof of the lover's divinity; such proof the lover furnishes by defeating the king's enemies and receives his due reward. By the side of this story which, in one form or another, was early known in the west, we may put the Nectanebus episode of the Alexander romance. Nectanebus, by means of his magic, changes himself to a dragon²⁶ and in this pretended incorporation of the god Ammon, begets Alexander. Here again we have an illustration of the reworking of old matter for, according to the authorities I have cited above, p. 138, it was the god himself who, in the form of a serpent, visited Olimpias; Philip happened to witness the adventure and, like the father of Plato, avoided intercourse with his wife. Some story of this type,—and there must have been many current in the mime

²⁵ *Pantschatantra*, I, 5, Benfey's translation, p. 48; cf. his *Einleitung*, pp. 159 sq., for oriental parallels, and pp. 162 sq. for western derivatives, and Clouston, *On the Magical Elements in Chaucer's Squire's Tale*, Chaucer Society, 2d ser., pp. 290 sq., 413 sq.; an echo of it is the episode of the flying horse in Cléomédès which carries the prince to the lady.

²⁶ Such is the version in the *de Prelüs*; in Thomas of Kent he simply disguises himself with a ram's head and dragon's tail; Gower, *Conf. Am.*, VI, 2063, follows the former version; cf. above, p. 133. On this story and its numerous congeners, in which a mortal pretends to be a supernatural being, often a devil, cf. Weinrich, *Der Trug des Nektanebos*, Leipzig, 1911; Soldan-Heppe, *Geschichte der Hexenprozesse*, II, pp. 398 sq.

and other forms of popular literature,—suggested to the author of *Flamenca*, I feel sure, the idea of making his lover disguise himself as a monk in order to carry out his designs on the lady.

It will be seen that in some of the stories which I have cited these two features, the imprisoned lady and the supernatural lover, have been combined to form one story; the lady in her place apart is visited by the supernatural being, either as such, or as a mortal,—as the husband, of course, if the lady happens to be married;—or she is visited by a mortal either in his own proper person or disguised as a supernatural being. It will be noticed, also, that a third feature is sometimes introduced, the discovery, namely, of the secret lover. This discovery is due in some of the stories I have cited, to the father of the girl, in case she is unmarried, or to the male or female attendants whom he has placed in charge of her, and the result is the banishment, or the exposure, of the girl and her child; in Ovid's story of Mercury and Herse, however, the latter's jealous sister makes the discovery. In case the lady is married, it is most often her husband who discovers the lovers together, and when he is convinced that the visitor is a supernatural being, he continues to live with his wife and passes as the father of the child. In a large number of modern stories, current chiefly in the orient and in western countries most accessible to influences from the orient, a jealous stepmother takes the place of the father in such stories as I have cited; in these cases it is she,—or a jealous sister of the girl as in Ovid's story,—who discovers the lover, generally by setting some sort of a snare by which he, if he appears in bird form, is caught and wounded.²⁷

We see, therefore, that, with the exception of this last feature, there was accessible to any French writer of the twelfth century a host of stories, written both in Latin and in French, and certainly not Celtic, which contained in combination all the salient features of the first part of *Yonec*. In Celtic literature, on the other hand, as far, at least, as we can judge from the evidence of Irish and Welsh tales, which may have been current at this time, we find the supernatural lover in bird form who visits a wife, now with the husband's permission, now without, in which case he is slain by the

²⁷ On this cycle of tales, commonly known as "The Jealous Stepmother," cf. Toldo, *Rom. Forsch.*, XVI, 609 sq.; Johnston, *P. M. L. A.*, XXI, 1905, pp. 331 sq.

husband, or a maiden, from whom, after one visit, he departs never to return. The wounding of the lover in the *Yonac*, which, to my mind is the essential feature of the poem, the one feature which explains and justifies the splendid conclusion, is not found either in the so-called Breton Lays or in any Irish tale which has been cited as a possible source of *Yonac* or as an analogue to it. What a *reductio ad absurdum* it is, therefore, to conclude, as Professor Cross does, that if we introduce into such Irish tales as those which he cites, the non-Celtic features of the *inclusa-motif*, the snare and the wounding of the lover, and the entire conclusion of the *Lay*,—the very features which make the poem an unified whole,—“the result would agree pretty closely with the plot of Marie’s poem,” and this result would be proof of its Celtic origin!

Just as illogical, on the other hand, is Professor Johnston in his attempt, in the article cited, to establish the source of the first part of this *Lay*. He realizes that without the snare and the wounding of the lover there would be no *Yonac*, and thinks, therefore, that the poem rests upon some version of the Jealous Stepmother story, in which these features always occur. The *Lay* must be Celtic, however; hence there must be in Irish literature some version of this story. This he finds, following Alfred Nutt, in the *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga*, although according to Stokes,²⁸ than whom, certainly, there is no higher authority, it is the father, not the stepmother, who orders the death of the child. In any case, however, there is not a hint that the stepmother shut the girl up in a tower or banished her,—features which occur, Professor Johnston states, in all versions of the Jealous Stepmother story which he has examined,—or set a trap to catch the lover. The first detail he finds, to be sure, in the Irish story: “in the early Irish version” (it occurs in a 14th MS.), “contained in the *Togail Bruidne*, the stepdaughter is placed in a calf-shed.” The unsuspecting reader would infer, of course, that the stepmother put her there, whereas the truth is that the stepmother, if she had a hand in the matter at all, ordered the child to be slain. The trap-episode is not in the Irish story but it ought to be there: “the fact that the motif of the wounded bird occurs in all the versions that we know of the story of the Jealous Stepmother, except in the *Togail Bruidne*, leads one

²⁸ *Revue Celtique*, XII, 1901, p. 19.

to believe that this early Irish version is incomplete, and that the incidents of the snare and the wounded bird were probably contained in the original form of the legend." Rather it leads one to believe that the *Togail Bruidne* is not a version of the story of the Jealous Stepmother at all, but is what Stokes' translation makes it out to be,—a version of the well-known story of the exposure by the father of a girl child. Sic abeat noverca; she does not appear in *Yonac* and we do not need her.²⁹

All the salient features of the first part of *Yonac*, therefore, can be traced to stories which were derived beyond any doubt from classical or oriental tradition and which were well-known in the west in the twelfth century. Some stories, moreover, as my examples show, contained practically all these features in combination. Whether there was, however, a story current before Marie which contained them all, no one can say, but the striking similarities between *Yonac* and the Russian tale of *Le faucon resplendissant*, cited by Toldo, op. cit., p. 628, and the various versions of this story current in Portuguese, Italian, and modern Greek, are strong evidence that there was. It is, of course, possible that Marie's story may have made its way into Russia, for there is "no limit which can be put to a story's power of flight per ora virum."³⁰ These modern tales have, therefore, little value in aiding us to determine the source of a mediaeval story unless we can be sure that the modern tale has been uninfluenced by the mediaeval story or by any of its derivatives, or that it comes from some story which, we can prove, was current prior to the tale in question. To such a story I would call attention, and I cite it not as the source of *Yonac*, but as evidence that the Russian tale of *Le Faucon* derives its main features from an oriental tale which, although strikingly alike *Yonac* on the one hand and the versions of the story of the Jealous Stepmother or Sisters on the other, could not have been influenced by either. This story is the second one in the collection of Mongolian tales known as *Ssiddi-Kür*,³¹ which, in turn, is a version of

²⁹ It is curious that Professor Johnston, who cites the modern Greek tale in Hahn, *Gr. u. Alb. Märchen*, pp. 97 sq., in which jealous sisters set the snare to catch the bird lover, does not notice No. 102 of this collection in which we have a bird lover but no jealous sisters or stepmother.

³⁰ Lang, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, II, p. 336.

³¹ Translated into German by Bergmann, *Nomadische Streifereien*, Riga, 1804, I, pp. 264 sq., whose version I paraphrase.

the Sanscrit *Vetalâpantschavinçati*, a collection of tales put together not later than the fifth century of our era. Many of the tales of both collections are found, also, in the *Pantschatantra*, *Hitopadesa*, *Arabian Nights*, *Kathâ Sarit Sâgara*, and other oriental collections, and they have been carried largely by Mongolians, Arabs, and Jews to all parts of the world.³²

A prince and a faithful attendant, after obtaining from frogs the power of spitting gold, set forth to seek their fortunes. They get possession of a magic cap which renders the wearer invisible, and a pair of boots, which carry the wearer whithersoever he wishes to go. Finally they arrive in a land of which the Chan has just died, and the young prince is made ruler in his stead, his attendant his minister. The former is about to marry the daughter of the former Chan, but his minister notices that every day the lady goes to a lofty building (tower) near the palace, and he determines to find out the reason for these visits. He puts on the magic cap and, unseen by her, follows her to the roof of the building. He watches her prepare dainty food³³ and arrange the couch, and presently there soars down from heaven a beautiful bird, which, singing sweet melody, alights on the roof and becomes a handsome man, Solangdu, son of Tangari.³⁴ The god spends the day with the lady and then, resuming his bird form, flies up to heaven. The same thing happens on the following day, when the lover tells the lady that on the morrow he will appear to her husband as a bird of paradise. The faithful minister thereupon tells his master of the affair, and they make arrangements to kill the bird. Hence, on the next day, the former, made invisible by his magic cap, seizes the

³² As an illustration of this fact it may be noted that the Sanscrit story of *The Weaver as Vishnu*, to which I have referred, occurs in *Siddi-Kür*, No. 1, in *Kathâ Sarit Sâgara*, *Arabian Nights*, and is almost universal; cf. the versions given by Clouston, Chaucer Soc., II Ser., pp. 290 sq., 413 sq. A comparison between the first and second tales in *Siddi-Kür* shows how closely connected are the two motifs of the supernatural lover and the mortal disguised as a supernatural being.

³³ So in the first story in *Siddi-Kür* the Chan's wife, at the bidding of her husband, who has seen the strange bird, carries food as an offering to it. This setting out of food for the visitor is retained in the Italian story of *King Bean*, Johnston, l. c., pp. 334-5, and in the Albanian tale given by Hahn, *op. cit.*, No. 102.

³⁴ The Tangari, in the Kalmuk belief, are divine beings of great power.

bird by the tail and throws it into a fire⁸⁵ made for this very purpose; the prince, who has been hiding, then rushes upon it with drawn sword, but before he can strike a mortal blow, the lady catches his arm and the bird escapes. On the following day the lady again goes to the tower, followed as before, by the minister; the bird with blood-stained plumage flies down on heavy wings, and at the sight the lady bursts into bitter weeping; her lover comforts her, however, and bids her dry her tears, assuring her that her husband has a mighty arm; he then tells her that he has been so severely wounded that he can visit her no more and flies off to his heaven; and the "Channin began to love her husband with her whole heart."

This story represents, beyond any doubt, the same oriental story which lies back of Toldo's Russian tale and the versions of the story of the Jealous Stepmother. It is, however, much closer to *Yonac* than any of these in that it furnishes us with a mortal husband and his faithful attendant who discovers the lover. We may conclude, therefore, with the utmost assurance, that the first part of *Yonac* rests upon some version of this oriental tale containing, it would seem, the search for the wounded lover by the lady, as in the Russian tale, and kindred stories, and ending, as the Portuguese version, cited by Johnston, l. c., p. 334, ends, with the death of the lover. Only on this hypothesis can be explained, it seems to me, the clumsy episode in *Yonac* of the first visit of the lady to her lover's abode.

The original author of *Yonac* knew, however, many other stories from oriental, classical, and Christian sources which dealt with the same general situation,—stories in which the lover is now a benign god or an angel, now a malevolent being, a devil or a wizard, now a mortal, and he did not hesitate to borrow from them details to adorn the story already in his hand. Hence the king's minister, the natural ward of the lady in the oriental tale, is replaced by an old woman, a familiar figure in classical tales of the type; the supernatural lover has to prove that he is of God and not of the devil by taking the sacrament, and finally, since he thus proves that he is of God, he can, like the angels and the saints, predict the sex

⁸⁵ It may be noted that in a modern Italian version dealing with this theme (*Romania*, X, pp. 122-3; Johnston, l. c., p. 333), the mysterious lover is burned by the fire which the jealous sisters put in the room.

of the child to be born and give him his name. The pagan author of the Alexander story was bothered by no such scruples in making Nectanebus take the place of Zeus.

This prophecy of the birth of a son formed the climax, as we have seen, of many a tale of hero or saint, too brave or good to be the offspring of mere mortals, and the happy thought came to the author of *Yonec*, whether Marie or not, no one can tell, that this episode afforded opportunity of connecting this story of the union between a divine being with a mortal woman and of the son born from this union, with another type of story with which he was just as familiar, the story, namely, of the union of a mortal man with a mortal maid and of the son born from this union,—some story of the type of Aegeus-Theseus, for example, or Sohrab and Rustem, or Sir Dagare, in which the mortal lover, after his secret visit, departs, leaving with the lady a recognition token, perhaps a sword, which she is to give to the boy when he becomes old enough to go forth into the world to seek him.

It was inevitable, of course, that the mediaeval writer would blend somewhat uncritically details of the two types of story. Thus in those stories in which the lover is really a divine being, the husband of the lady is always content, after he discovers the union, to continue living with his wife without question, whereas in stories of the other type in which the lover is a mortal, he either punishes his wife or else is further deceived, in one way or another, by her.³⁶ Owing, therefore, to a confusion between these two themes, the author of *Yonec*, in order to explain how the husband, after the discovery of his wife's infidelity, could continue to live with her without question, introduces the magic ring which will make him forget.³⁷ This detail and the first visit of the lady to Muldumarec's abode illustrate the evil results of such confusion of stories of different types; on the other hand it is this very same confusion which

³⁶ This, of course, has always been a favorite motif with story-tellers; cf. *Pantschatantra*, ed. Benfey, *Einleitung*, pp. 145 sq., 331 sq., 371 sq., for examples from both oriental and western literature.

³⁷ This reminds one of the famous "ring of forgetfulness," *Gesta Rom.*, X, and Oesterley's note. It may be, however, that this ring served in the original story to bring the lover to the lady, a well-known device; cf. Clouston, *op. cit.*, pp. 338 sq.; Toldo, *Rom. Forsch.*, XVI, 1904, pp. 623 sq. The author of *Yonec*, in changing the purpose of the ring, makes the lover come at the lady's wish simply, an idea which is also common.

renders possible the fine conclusion of the *Lay*. We have seen that in those stories in which the child is really the son of a bona fide divine being and the wife of a mortal, he learns the truth of his birth from his mother and is content with this; or she may have definite proofs to offer him, as in the stories of Demaratus and Seleucus, or he may, as Phaethon in Ovid, *Met.*, I, 748 sq., demand such proof even from his divine father. If, however, the child is the son of a maiden who has been visited by a divine being and who has been punished by her father or guardian upon the discovery of the union, the son may in due time slay the one responsible for the punishment of his mother, and gain possession of his kingdom; thus Perseus slays Acrisius who first shut Danaë up in her brazen tower and then, after the birth of the child, exposed her, and Romulus kills Amulius who had cast his mother into the Tiber because he did not believe that Mars was the father of the twins. In those stories, on the other hand, in which the child is the result of a union of an unknown mortal and a mortal maiden, the child sets out in due time, in some cases accompanied by his mother, and finds his father by means of the recognition token which the father had left for him. The author of the *Yonac*, therefore, having chosen for the first part of his poem, a story in which the wife of a mortal is visited by a supernatural being who is wounded by the husband and departs, never to return again, or dies from his wounds, joined to it the theme of the prophecy by this divine father of the birth of a boy, and continued the poem by working with a story of a son born to a mortal maiden from a secret union with a mortal. The bird lover of the first story dies, and the search for the mortal father of the other leads, therefore, to his tomb; the sword which, in the latter story, should lead to the recognition of the son, becomes the weapon with which this son visits vengeance not, as in the story of the persecuted daughter, upon him who was responsible for the mother's suffering, but upon him who, in the bird-lover story, has killed his father. It is obvious that strict logic could not be secured by such means, and the *Yonac* is not logical, but we are willing to dispense with logic in return for the fine conclusion which results from its absence.

Such a reconstruction of the *Lay of Yonac* ascribes no great degree of originality to its author, makes no excessive demands

upon our credulity, and avoids the unsupported assumptions of those who argue for the Celtic, or Irish, origin either of the *Lay* in the form in which we have it, or any of its essential features. All these features were at the hand of any French poet of the twelfth century, and practically all of them had already been combined in a large number of tales certainly not Celtic, and certainly as widely known and as accessible as any possible Irish or Welsh tale which may have contained the same or similar features.

M. B. OGLE

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

THE DESCENDANTS OF GANELON—AND OF OTHERS

PROFESSOR PIO RAJNA in an article published over forty years ago on *Le origini delle famiglie Padovane e gli eroi dei romanzi cavallereschi*, cited from the *Liber de generatione aliquorum civium urbis Paduae, tam nobilium quam ignobilium*, written in the early part of the fourteenth century by Giovanni de Nono a Paduan, a curious passage in regard to the ancestry of the D'Este family:

Fertur comuniter quod hii nobiles marchiones fuerunt de progenie Heugani proditoris.¹

The great Italian scholar pointed out that this Heuganus, or better Heuganeus, was Ganelon, the traitor of old French epic, who owed the transformation of his name to local tradition, but neither he,² nor any one else has brought forward any confirmatory evidence of this Italian tradition. However, this evidence has been available since the year before the publication of Rajna's article, in the *Andanças é viajes de Pero Tafur*. This Spanish nobleman stayed for some two weeks in June, 1438, at Ferrara,³ where he picked up the following tradition in regard to the ruling family:

Este marqués de Ferrara es natural de Francia, é áun dizen que es de linaje de Galalon, é que le fazen aquellas çirimonias del pan como á los otros, que es ponelle al revés en la mesa é despues tornarlo de faz. Dizen que fué al rey de Françia á le suplicar que le diese armas é le quitase aquel uso, é el rey de Françia le dió armas, pero dixo, que lo otro non lo podía fazer.⁴

Diego de Valera in his *Crónica abreviada de España*, completed in 1481, among other references to Charlemagne and his peers states:

¹ *Romania*, IV (1875), 169.

² Cf. *ibid.*, XLII (1913), 573; A. Sorrentino, "La Leggenda troiana nell'epopea cavalleresca di M. M. Boiardo," *Bulletin ital.*, XVII (1917), 34.

³ Ed. Jimenez de la Espada (*Coleccion de libros españoles raros o curiosos*, VIII), 1874, 597.

⁴ *Ib.*, 223-4.

Galalon . . . de cuyo linaje aún hoy viven algunos en Francia. Y cuando quiera que alguno de estos come con otros, le ponen en la mesa el pan al revés,⁵

a tradition the author may have picked up in France, where he travelled in 1437, and 1442 to 1445.⁶

But this custom was not restricted to members of the family of Ganelon, for in Scotland it has been reckoned ill-breeding to "whummle the bannock," that is to say, turn a loaf with its bottom-side up, in the presence of a Menteith, because, according to tradition, when Sir William Wallace was taken prisoner the fifth of August, 1305, at Robroyston,⁷ a barn three miles N. W. of Glasgow, such a signal to take him unawares was given by Sir John Menteith, or one of his followers.⁸ If this reminds one of the expression "Veniant fructus," spoken at the end of a banquet by Alberigo de Manfredi, as a signal to murder his near relations,⁹ an act for which he was damned to eternity in the lowest bolgia of hell by Dante,¹⁰ all we know of the capture of Wallace does not fit in with such a situation. In the fullest account of his capture given in Robert of Brunne's translation of the *Chronicle* of Pierre de Langtoft, the capture was made by Menteith, when Wallace was in bed with his mistress, through the treachery of one of his attendants, Jack Short.¹¹ But it is not necessary to seek even the authority of a historical tradition to explain the custom, as it is only

⁵ Cap. ix, fol. 36, ed. Sevilla, 1562, cited by L. de Torre y Franco-Romera, *Mosén Diego de Valera. Apuntaciones biograficas*, Madrid, 1914, 57, n. 5. The passage is referred to, but not cited, by Jimenez de la Espada, *op. cit.*, 453.

⁶ de Torre y Franco-Romero, *op. cit.*, 17-18, 28-41.

⁷ According to J. Taylor, *Pictorial History of Scotland*, New York, n. d., I, 110; II, 362; Robroyston is three miles N.W. of Glasgow. It seems preferable to accept the statement given in Cassell's *Gazetteer of Great Britain*, II, 262. According to an account of Wallace's capture published in the *Illustrations of Scottish History* (Maitland Club, 1834), he was taken in Glasgow at the house of one "Rawe Raas," i. e., Ralph Ray.

⁸ Sir Walter Scott, *Tales of a Grandfather; Being Stories Taken from Scottish History*, First Series (1827), ch. v.; Andrew Lang, *History of Scotland*, I, 196; C. E. Rogers, *Book of Wallace*, 1889, II, 228-9.

⁹ Benvenuto da Imola, *Comentum super Dantis Comoedian*, II, 539-40; *Rime ant.*, *senesi*, 19.

¹⁰ *Inferno*, XXXIII, 118 ff.

¹¹ Ed. Hearne, 329. On the other evidence cf. Tytler, *History of Scotland* (1841), I, 384-390. The pretty story of the bull's head being presented to the Douglasses at the end of a banquet given them at Edinburgh Castle by James II

the case of a general custom of chivalric rules being attached to such notorious names as those of Ganelon and Menteith. Du Cange cites from a manuscript *de officio Heraldorum* an interesting passage:

Se aucun Chevalier ou Gentilhomme avoit fait trahison en aucune partie et estoit assis à table avec autres Chevaliers, ou Gentilshommes, ledit Roy d'armes ou Heraut lui doit aller couper sa touaille devant lui, et lui virer le pain au contraire, s'il en est requis par aucuns Chevaliers ou Gentilhommes, lequel doit estre prest de le combattre sur sette querelle: car ce n'est pas belle chose, que un traistre soit honnouré comme un autre Chevalier ou Gentilhomme.¹²

Du Cange has not listed this work among the "Scriptores Gallici vernaculi qui soluta oratione scripserunt, MSS.," used by him,¹³ nor has it been possible for me to trace it, in studying the fate of his library.¹⁴

This passage in Du Cange has been used or cited by Le Grand d'Aussy,^{14a} Jacob Grimm,¹⁵ Michelet,¹⁶ and Löher,¹⁷ but none of

(1439), as a signal of their death has only the authority of Hector Boece (*Scotorum historia*, 363): "Gubernator, assentiente Cancellario, . . . amotis epulis, taurinum caput apponi jubet. Id enim est apud nostrates supplicii capitalis symbolum." It is confirmed neither by contemporary authorities, nor by the tradition of custom, Teutonic or Celtic. Sir Walter Scott (*op. cit.*, ch. xviii) made the bull's head black, on the authority of the phrase "black dinner" in a ballad verse preserved by Hume of Godscroft (*History of the House of Douglas and Angus*, I, 287), of which a variant is found in a recently discovered copy of the first edition (G. P. Johnston, "The First Edition of Hume of Godscroft's History", *Papers of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society*, 1899-1901, 163, and Facsimile). The same tradition is attached to a Highland laird, Sir Duncan Campbell of Glenurcha (1560-1631), and introduced by John Leyden in his ballad "The Cout of Keeldar" (Sir Walter Scott, *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border, Poetical Works*, 1833, IV, 280-1). Cf. Tytler, *op. cit.*, IV, 33-4; A. Lang, *op. cit.*, I, 354.

¹² *Glossarium med. et inf. Latinitatis*, s. v. *mensale dividere*.

¹³ Cf. *Glossarium*, ed. Didot, 1850, VII, 448.

¹⁴ For the sources of such a study cf. L. Delisle, *Cabinet des manuscrits*, I, 426, n. 2.

^{14a} *Hist. de la vie privée des François* (1782), ed. de Roquefort, III (1815), 167. The editor wrongly refers to Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye, *Mem. sur l'ancienne Chevalerie*, 1781, I, 319, 384, as the source of the quotation, instead of to Du Cange.

¹⁵ *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer* (1828), 4th ed., 1899, II, 304-5.

¹⁶ *Origines du Droit français* (1836), ed. Calman Lévy, *Œuvres compl.*, 300-1.

¹⁷ Franz Löher, *Jacobäa von Bayern und ihre Zeit*, 1862, I, 447.

these scholars has traced it to its source, or quoted corroborative evidence on the custom of turning the bread. Here, as elsewhere, in his article relating to heraldry,¹⁸ Du Cange is using late evidence, and to judge from the language of the passage cited, his authority is more recent than *Les Statutz et ordonnances des heraulx d'armes*, which was completed January 4, 1464, by its author Jean le Fèvre,¹⁹ Seigneur de Saint-Remy, known better to his contemporaries by his heraldic title, Toison d'or.²⁰ Du Cange cites at length a part of this work *Comment le Roy d'armes des François fust premiere-ment créé, et puis nommé Monjoye*,²¹ evidently from a manuscript in which it appeared as a separate work.²² In a manuscript of the complete work,²³ or in the edition printed as his own work, by Robert Gaguin as a supplement to his translation of Livy,²⁴ which was published c. 1508 by Vérard,²⁵ he would have found an earlier variant of the same text:

Item se aulcun cheualier ou gentil homme auoit fait trayson en aulcune partie et icelluy fust assis a table aueques aultres cheualiers ou gentiz hommes, ledit roy darmes ou herault luy doit aller couper sa touaille deuant luy & virer le pain au contraire.²⁶

A similar passage is doubtless to be found in the heraldic work of one, who was at once a contemporary and associate of Jean Le

¹⁸ P. Meyer, *Romania*, XI, 36.

¹⁹ L. Thuasne, *Roberti Gaguini Epistole et orationes*, 1903, I, 112. Thuasne refers to the author as Jacques Lefébvre (!).

²⁰ *Chronique de Jean le Fèvre Seigneur de Saint-Remy*, ed. Morand, I (1876), iv.

²¹ *s. v.* heraldus. This has been abridged and modernized by Marc de Vulson, sieur de la Colombière in his treatise *De l'office des rois d'armes, des hérauts et des poursuivans* (1649), "Extrait d'un vieux Héraut," which has been reprinted in C. Leber, *Collections de Pièces relatives à l'histoire de France*, XIII (1838), 432-5.

²² As in a manuscript noted by Morand, *op. cit.*, I, lix.

²³ Morand, *op. cit.*, lviii; Thuasne, *op. cit.*, 112, n. 3.

²⁴ A. W. Pollard, *Cat. of Man. and Early Printed Books . . . forming portion of the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*, 1907, *Early Printed Books*, II, 269 (No. 556); III, 255, 266, regards the work as a version of the *Gesta romanorum*, repeating the blunder of Panzer, Warton, Barbier (*Dict. des œuvres Anonymes*), and the *Cat. of Printed Books in the British Museum*.

²⁵ J. Macfarlane, *Antoine Verard*, 1900, 82; Pollard, *op. cit.*, II, 269.

²⁶ *Ed. Verard*, p. ccxviii. For tracing down and copying the passage in the copy in the Morgan collection, I am indebted to my friend, Dr. Raymond Weeks.

Fèvre. The author of *Le Comportement des armes*,²⁷ unlike Le Fèvre, is only known under his heraldic title as herald of arms "Sézille" in the Ordre de la Toison d'or,²⁸ in which Le Fèvre was "roy d'armes."²⁹ He, also, had the title of "maréchal d'armes du pays de Hainault," since he had had "de present et de longtems domicile et résidence en la bonne ville de Mons en Hainau."³⁰ He was the author of another heraldic work, which has been printed a number of times, *Le Blason des couleurs*,³¹ while only one manuscript is known of the *Comportement des armes*. If this work is dedicated "à très puissant roy Alphonse d'Arragon, de Sicille,"³²

²⁷ P. Paris, *Les manuscrits françois de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, III, 1840, 281-7.

²⁸ *Chronique de Jean de Févre*, II, 205, where the author states in his account of the creation of the order, "A toutes icelles ordanances furent . . . pour heraulx, Sécille, Bretaigne, Orenge, Saint-Pol," etc. One of the "reyes de armas" of the household of Prince Don Juan, son of Ferdinand and Isabella, who died in 1498, had the title "Sicilia" (Gonçalo F. de Oviedo y Valdés, *Libro de la Camara Real del Principe D. Juan e officios de su casa e seruicio ordinario*, ed. J. M. Escudero de la pena [Soc. de Bibl. esp.], 1870, 147, n.).

²⁹ *Ib.*, I, 3; II, 204, 292.

³⁰ Paris, *op. cit.*, 282. In the incipit of his *Blason des couleurs*, printed at Paris by Le Caron is the statement "A/present e de longtemps ayant domicile en la bonne ville de mons en/henault"; M. Pellechet-Poulain, *Cat. gén. des Incunables des bibl. publ. de France*, III (1905), 13.

³¹ Cf. Brunet, *Manuel du libraire*, s. v. *Blason des armes*, where the author has confused an anonymous work of the first part of the fifteenth century with that title with the work of Sézille. The *Blason des armes*, printed in full from a manuscript by L. Douet-D'Arc (*Rev. archéol.*, XV, 1852, 321-342), had its first part printed and bound with the work of Sézille, in a Paris edition, of which the printer and date is unknown (*Ib.*, 271-2), as is the case of the editions of the two works published by Le Caron in 1495 (Pellechet-Poulain, *l. c.*), and of the editions described by Brunet. P. Paris did not correct the latter's blunder (*op. cit.*, 282) and it has been perpetuated by Copinger (*Suppl. to Hain's Repert. Bibliogr.*, II, 1066), Pellechet-Poulain and Thuasne (*op. cit.*, I, 114, n. 1).

³² The incipit of the *Blason des couleurs* reads: "Je sicille herault à tres puissant roy alphonse daragon, etc." The dedication of the *Comportement des armes* has escaped the attention of P. Meyer, "De l'Expansion de la Langue française en Italie pendant le Moyen-Age," *Atti del Congresso internaz. de Scienze storiche*, IV (1904), 98. One cannot find the work mentioned in the various inventories of the library of the Aragonese kings of Naples, but in the inventory, made in 1550, of the books found in the library of the Duke of Calabria at Valencia, is found mention of two printed books, of which one may be *Le Blason des couleurs* of Sicille, "un libro . . . en lengua francesa en que estan las armas de todos los principes christianos" and "Otro libro . . . en

it was because he was titular herald to that monarch—quite a different thing from being his herald⁸³—since the creation of the Order of the Toison d'or in 1431 by Philippe le Bon of Burgundy, to whom as the chief of a delegation of heralds he presented at Arras in 1434 a petition to reorganize the orders of chivalry,⁸⁴ and at the time of writing both treatises, had, as we have seen, lived for years at Mons. However, as Alfonso died in 1458, it is clear that the *Comportement* antedates the treatise of Le Fèvre. Further he has included in it the "Traitté que fist ung très solennel et notable clerc nommé maistre Jehan Herard touchant l'office d'armes." This work defines the qualities, the appointment and the duties of the different heralds, "poursuivant," "herault," "maréchal," and "roi d'armes,"⁸⁵ and among the duties of the last may be given that of publishing at the table the ill fame of unworthy knights.⁸⁶ Such an office is not assigned to them, however, in works of the seventeenth century such as Francis Thynne's *A Discourse of the Dutye and Office of a Heraulde of Armes* (1606),⁸⁷ Fauchet's dissertation *De l'origine des Heraux*,⁸⁸ and the treatise of Marc de Vulson, sieur de la Colombière, *De l'office des rois d'armes, des héraults et des poursuivans*.⁸⁹

lengua francesca escriptas, en que se ponen y nombran los blasones y las armas de los principes"; G. Mazzatini, *La Biblioteca dei re d'Aragona in Napoli*, 1897, cl, Nos. 629-30.

⁸³ As stated by Paris (282) and Thuasne (114, n. 1).

⁸⁴ Paris, 285-6; M. Gachard, *La bibl. nat. à Paris. Not. et extr. des man. qui concernent l'histoire de Belgique*, 1873, 339.

⁸⁵ Paris, 283-4; Thuasne, 114, n. 1 ff, 25-30. Paris, B. N. f. fr. 6993 of the old classification and 389 of the new according to Paris, if Thuasne gives it as 387. Sézille is candid in stating "en tout ce que j'en ay touchié n'y riens adjousté du mien, ains est selon ce que j'en ay peu scavoir et trouvé par escript mis au brief," fol. 25 (Thuasne, 114, n.). In the same way Olivier de la Marche incorporates into his *L'avis de gaige de bataille* the treatise of Jean de Villers on the same subject (B. Prost, *Traité du duel judiciaire*, 1872, 28-41, cf. p. viii).

⁸⁶ Perhaps, a similar passage may be found in *L'estat et comportement des armes* of Jean Scohier, Bruxelles, 1597, and Paris, 1630.

⁸⁷ T. Hearne, *Collection of Curious Discourses on English Antiquities*, 1775, I, 139-162; on date cf. F. J. Furnivall, F. Thynne, *Animadversions*, etc., 1875, cxx. Nothing is found to the purpose in the essay of Doddridge with the same title in the same *Collection*, 163 ff.

⁸⁸ *Œuvres*, Paris, 1610, 515-19.

⁸⁹ *Op. cit.*, 379-421. There is nothing to be found to the point in the oaths administered to the various holders of the office in the reigns of Henry VIII

But this act of discourtesy towards traitors and their kin was something more than a conventional symbol; it was based on more general and primitive conceptions. To put a loaf on the table, wrong side up, is regarded in popular usage in France as not only a sign of bad breeding,^{39a} a token on the part of a servant that he was dissatisfied with his position,⁴⁰ but also as an ill omen,⁴¹ of which the evil spirits, devils⁴² or sorcerers⁴³ would take advantage by dancing on the inverted loaf. According to German popular belief such an act gave over the house to evil spirits,⁴⁴ and brought bad luck, although it was also one way to keep a witch from going out of the room.⁴⁵ So it is evident that what was generally regarded as an act of discourtesy or ill-omen, as supposed to be the proper portion of the kin of traitors.

For the alternative symbolic denunciation of an unworthy knight, mentioned in these heraldic rules, there is earlier and more abundant evidence, not only in the way of rules appertaining to the duties of heralds, but in specific mentions of its practise.⁴⁶ In a prologue to Freidank's *Bescheidenheit*, written in the fourteenth century,⁴⁷ the author is made to complain that, were it not for fear of their lives, the heralds:

vor künden, fürsten si niht vermiten,
daz si diu tischtüechner vor in zeschniten,
sô si westen ûf eine tât,⁴⁸

(*Arch. Journ.*, XIII (1856), 164-70, and of Elizabeth (*Gentlemens' Mag.*, 1838, II, 490-2), and in those printed by Weever (*Funerall Monuments*, ed. 1767, 414-19). I have not been able to consult Jean le Feron, *De la primitive Institution des Roys, Heraults et Poursuivans d'Armes*, Paris, 1555.

^{39a} Pérot, *Folk-Lore Bourbonnais*, 1908, 179.

⁴⁰ L. Pineau, *Le Folk-Lore du Poitou*, 1892, 405-6.

⁴¹ G. de Launay, "Trad. et sup. de l'Anjou," *Rev. d. T. pop.*, VIII, 94.

⁴² L. E. Sauve, *Le Folk-Lore des Hautes Vosges*, 1889, 383.

⁴³ G. B. Andrews, "Traditions, superstitions et coutumes du Mentonnais," *Rev. des Trad. pop.*, IX, 334. The act makes witches angry; Pineau, *op. cit.*, 505.

⁴⁴ F. Staub, *Das Brot im Spiegel schweizer-deutscher Volks-Sprache und Sitte*, 1868, 18; A. Wuttke, *Der. deutsche Volksglaube der Gegenwart*, 3d ed., 310.

⁴⁵ *Ib.*, 283.

⁴⁶ Du Cange, s. v., *mensam dividere*; Grimm, *l. c.*; Michelet, *l. c.*

⁴⁷ The paper manuscript, Wolfenbüttl., Bibl. 2, 4, Aug. fol. is of the fifteenth or sixteenth century; cf. W. Grimm, *Vridankes Bescheidenheit*, 1834, x; O. von Heinemann, *Die Handschriften der Herzoglich. Bibl. zu Wolfenbüttel*, II, 1, 68.

⁴⁸ W. Grimm, *Berl. Acad. Abhandl.*, 1849, 353-4.

and the same thought is expressed in the *Teufels Netz*;

Es wurden och die lastberer bescholten
 Von den barzafar und herolten;
 Wo si kamen für si ze tisch,
 Da schnitten si das tischlach frisch
 Den herren von der schosse,
 Das si sassen rott und blosse
 Und grosz scham enphiengen
 Und in übel im turner ergiengen.
 Da pflag man der eren hord.⁴⁹

according to Alain Chartier in his *Quadrilogue invectif*, written in 1426, Bertrand du Guesclin, who died in 1380,

laissa de son temps une telle remonstrance en memoire de discipline, et de Chevalerie, dont nous parlons, que quiconque homme noble se fourfaisait reprochablement en son estat, on lui venoit au manger, trancher la nape devant soi.⁵⁰

Further, there are two striking instances of its practise, one in Germany and one in France, occurring at the end of the fourteenth century. When Ulrich, the son of Graf Eberhard der Rauschebart, returned unwounded from his defeat at the battle of Reutlingen in 1377, the heroic father so took to heart the disaster that

perhibetur mappam mensae inter se et filium intersecuisse.⁵¹

In 1394, when William, count of Ostervant, the heir of the Duchy of Holland and Hainault, was sitting at the table of the French king in Paris, on the day of Epiphany,

ecce, supervenit quidam Heraldus, scindens et dividens mensale ante jam dictum Comitem Willelmum, asserens non decere Prin-

⁴⁹ Ed. Barach, 1863, vv. 7786-94. These verses are only found in MS. C, written in 1449 (*ed. cit.*, p. 438) and not in A which represents best the original work, which was not written before 1414-1418. Ph. Strauch, *Anz. f. d. Alterthum*, XXXIV (1910), 258.

⁵⁰ *Oeuvres* (1677), 451.

⁵¹ Crusius, *Annales Suevici* (1596), Pars III, lib. V, cap. 11: Anno 1378, cited by P. Eichholtz, *Quellenstudien zu Uhlands Balladen*, 1879, 82-3; cf. B. F. Stälin, *Württembergische Geschichte*, III (1856), 321-2. Stälin in his later work, *Geschichte Württembergs*, I (1887), 552, refers to the sources of the story as "nicht genügend beglaubigte spätere Erzählungen."

cipem sedere aliquem ad Mensam Regis, qui clypeo seu armis privatus esset.⁵²

To the indignant count, asking for the cause of this gross insult, as he had both shield and arms, the "heraldus Senior" answered, that the body of his great-uncle, William, Count of Holland, lay unavenged, after defeat, in the territory of the Frisians.⁵³ This was incentive enough for the count to strive to win back his own. The German instance, only one of several incidents in the life of a truly epic figure, found its due place in a poetical setting in one of the group of ballads on Graf Eberhard der Rauschebart, written in 1815 by the scholar poet, Ludwig Uhland.⁵⁴ The heroic Schwabian hero had already attracted the attention of Schiller, who in emulation of Gleim's *Grenadierliedern*,⁵⁵ offered as his contribution, in the way of a patriotic poem, in a friendly competition with Friedrich Haug, his *Graf Eberhard der Greiner von Württemberg*,⁵⁶ which was first published in his *Anthologie auf das Jahr 1782*. The source of this poem has not been pointed out,⁵⁷ but the youthful poet either failed to find there, or to signal out, this par-

⁵² Johannes a Leydis, *Chron. de comitibus Hollandiae*, Libr. 31, cap. 50; in F. Sweertius, *Rer. Belgic. annales*, I (Francof., 1620), 312; cf. Guilelm. Heda, *Hist. episcop. Ultraiectensium*, ed. Lap. v. Waveren, in ed. *Chron. Joannis de Beka*, Ultraicti, 1642; ann. 1395. "Fecialis quem Heraldum vocant, laceravit Mantile sibi antepositum." Jan van Naeldwijk, *Het Oude Goutsche Chronycken*, ed. P. Scriverius, Amsterdam, 1663, 112; R. Snoyus, *De Rebus Batavicis*, ed. J. Cool, ap. Sweertium, *op. cit.*, II, 130. The relationship of these various chronicles has never been studied except by J. Bolhuis van Zeeburgh, who, in a paper on "Hollandsche Geschiedbronnen voor het Beiersche Tijdperk," *Bijdr. v. vaderland, geschiedenis*, N. R., VIII, 347-76, shows a common source for the works of a Leydis and van Naeldwijk. The authority is referred to, on the authority of a Leydis by J. Wagenaar, *Vaderlandsche Historie*, III (1791), 330, but is given in detail and with comments, by F. Löher, *Jacobäa von Bayern und ihre Zeit*, 1862, I, 195, 447.

⁵³ Cf. Löher, *op. cit.*, I, 72.

⁵⁴ *Gedichte*, ed. E. Schmidt und J. Hartmann, II, 104-5.

⁵⁵ This unconfirmed statement (*Schillers sämtliche Werke*, ed. Guntter und Witkowski, III, 251), may well be true in the light of the great enthusiasm Gleim's work stirred in Herder, Lessing and Goethe (A. Koberstein, *Gr. d. Ges. d. deutsch. Nationalliteratur*, 5th ed., II, 350-1), and among Schiller's own associates (J. Hartmann, *Schillers Jugendfreunde*, 1904, 45).

⁵⁶ E. Boas, *Schillers Jugendjahre*, 1856, II, 161.

⁵⁷ F. Jonas, *Erläuterungen der Jugendgedichte Schillers*, 1900, 132.

ticular incident.⁵⁸ There seems, no doubt, on the other hand, that the source of Uhland's poem was the compilation of Crusius, and later Württemberg historians,⁵⁹ and from one or two phrases developed the ringing stanza:

Dem Vater gegenüber sitzt Ulrich an den Tisch,
Er schlägt die Augen nieder, man bringt ihm Wein und Fisch;
Da faszt der Greis ein Messer, und spricht kein Wort dabei,
Und schneidet zwischen Beiden das Tafeltuch entzwei.⁶⁰

But if Uhland could, with the magic wand of poetry, evoke from the past the forgotten symbol of the branding of untrue knights, he has not shown the prophetic spirit of a bard, in the compliment he pays to a race of royal traitors and perjurers, in enumerating those who perished in the battle, in which the son of his hero played the recreant:

O Zollern! deine Leiche unschwebt ein lichter Kranz:
Sahst du vielleicht noch strebend dein Haus im künft'gen Glanz?⁶¹

GEORGE L. HAMILTON

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

⁵⁸ Düntzer, *Schillers lyrische Gedichte* I (1874), 429-30, has noted the poet's failure to use the traditional trait of which Uhland availed himself.

⁵⁹ Eicholtz, *l. c.*, *Gedichte*, ed. cit., II, 104.

⁶⁰ *Die Schlacht bei Reutlingen*, vv. 81-5.

⁶¹ *Ib.*, vv. 63-4.

LA VIE DE SAINTE EUPHROSINE

THE anonymous Old French poem on the life of Saint Euphrosine belongs to that section of hagiographic literature which narrates the legends of the Eastern saints, such as Saint Alexis, Saint Nicholas, Saint Mary the Egyptian and Saint Thaïs. The complete poem has never been published, but extracts from the beginning and conclusion have been printed by M. Paul Meyer,¹ who has called attention to its literary merit, which he considers quite superior to that usually found in this type of composition. Petit de Julleville has shown his admiration for the sincerity of the unknown author as well as for the simplicity of his style. By some the work is considered to resemble a *chanson de geste*, particularly on account of its metrical structure. It is composed in alexandrines arranged in monorhymed strophes usually of ten verses each.

MANUSCRIPTS

As far as is known, the poem is preserved only in the following four manuscripts; which I have arranged according to their age and importance.

O. Oxford, Bodleian, Canon. Misc. 74, fols. 87^r–108^v.

B. Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 9229–30, fols. 61^r–70^v.

H. The Hague, Bibliothèque Royale, Th. 389, fols. 61^r–70^v.

A. Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 5204, fols. 87^v–97^v.

MS. O has been described in detail by M. Paul Meyer,² who places it in the early part of the thirteenth century. It is a small volume almost square containing 138 folios and it differs from the other three MSS. in having only one column on the page, thus allowing enough space for the alexandrines, which usually occupy the

¹ The first three and last four strophes from the Oxford MS. Canon. Misc. 74 in *Documents manuscrits de l'ancienne littérature de la France*, pp. 203 f. The same author has included the last 140 verses from the same MS. in his *Recueil d'anciens textes*, 2^e part., pp. 334 ff., and in the same publication, pp. ii–iv he has printed a corresponding group from MS. 5204 of the Arsenal Library at Paris.

² *Documents manuscrits*, pp. 145–150, *Archives des Miss. sc.* pp.

two lines in the other MSS. The contents of this MS. are as follows: *Vie de Saint Alexis*,³ fols. 1-19^r; *Poème moral*,⁴ fols. 19^r-62^r; *Vie de Sainte Juliane*,⁵ fols. 62^r-84^v (fols. 85^r-86^v are blank); *Vie de Sainte Euphrosine*,⁶ fols. 87^r-108^v; *Vie de Sainte Marie l'Egyptienne*,⁷ fols. 109^r-119^v; *Vie de Saint Andrier l'apostle*,⁸ fols. 120^r-131^r; *Li Ver del Juise*,⁹ fols. 131^r-138. It has already been pointed out by both Paul Meyer and Cloetta that the MS. is in different handwritings, all dating however from the beginning of the thirteenth century. The first three poems (fols. 1-85) are in the same hand, which is not the same as that found in fols. 87-119. The last part of the MS. (fols. 120-138) is not by the same hand that wrote the part immediately preceding. However it shows close resemblance to the first hand with which perhaps it may be identical.¹⁰ Whether or not this be the case, it is certain that the fourth and fifth poems, i.e. *La Vie de Sainte Euphrosine* and *La Vie de Sainte Marie l'Egyptienne* (fols. 87-119) were written by the same scribe and that this scribe did not write the other poems in the MS., although his handwriting is of the same period as that found in the rest of the MS. As neither of these two poems has been published except in the extracts printed by Paul Meyer, it is

³ Edited by Joseph Herz: *Abdruck aus dem Programme der Realschule der israel. Gemeinde*, Frankfurt a. M., 1879. Extracts in *Documents MSS.*, pp. 182-4.

⁴ Edited by Cloetta in *Romanische Forschungen*, III, 1-268. Extracts in *Documents MSS.*, pp. 184-199; Meyer's *Recueil*, 2d part, pp. 321-334.

⁵ Published by Hugo von Feilitzen: *Li Ver del Juise*, Upsala, 1883 Appendix. Extracts in *Documents MSS.*, pp. 199 ff.

⁶ Extracts in *Documents MSS.*, pp. 203 f.; *Recueil*, 2d part, pp. 334-338 and ii-iv.

⁷ Extracts in *Documents MSS.*, p. 205.

⁸ Extracts in *Documents MSS.*, pp. 205 ff.

⁹ Extracts in *Documents MSS.*, pp. 207 f.

¹⁰ Paul Meyer states that the MS. is written by two different hands (*Documents MSS.*, p. 145 n.), but in a note to the extract from *La Vie de Saint Andrier*, p. 206, he remarks "ici l'écriture change encore une fois, tout en restant du même temps. This seems to indicate that there are three different handwritings. Such was at first Cloetta's opinion (*Poème moral*, p. 12). However after comparing different letters in the effort to discover a difference of orthography, he admits (p. 26) that the copyist of the last two poems of the MS. may be the same one who transcribed the first three pieces (fols. 1-85). Concerning this he is unable to come to a definite conclusion.

therefore important to study the language of this scribe and see in what points it differs from the language of the first scribe, which has been fully discussed by Cloetta in his edition of the *Poème Moral*, and from that of *Li Ver del Juise* which has been treated by Feilitzen in his introduction to that poem.

The second MS. is 9229-30 of the Bibliothèque Royale of Brussels. It is a beautiful parchment of the latter part of the thirteenth century and formerly belonged to the library of the Dukes of Burgundy. It figures in the catalogue of Viglius in 1577 and also in that of Barrois.¹¹ It bears great similarity in contents and order to MS. H, described below, as has been noted by Van Hamel.¹² It consists of 189 folios and is written three columns to the page with usually 50 vv. in each column. The initials are in red, blue and gold and the miniatures are large and beautiful. The MS. is really divided into two parts, the first containing the *Miracles de Notre Dame*, and the second the *Vies des Pères en Vers*. There are 40 *miracles* and 83 *vies*. Our poem is No. 38 of the *Miracles* of Our Lady. It bears the following rubric: *De Sainte Euphrosine qui fu moine XXXVIII ans sanz estre conneue*. The language of this MS. is that of Ile de France. There are several cases of *e* for *ai*, and *an* for *en*.

MS. H belongs to the collection of the Royal Library of The Hague, where it is catalogued as Th. 389, not 265 as stated by M. Paul Meyer.¹³ It is a fine parchment written in a hand of the fourteenth century and measures 43 by 32 centimetres. It contains 189 fols., the same number as MS. B, which it closely resembles. It is written three columns to the page, 48 vv. in each column. There are two parts to the volume, but the handwriting remains the same. Like MS. B, the language is that of Central France. There are many evidences of the carelessness of the scribe, such as imperfect lines, repetitions and misreadings. Van Hamel¹⁴ has noted the great similarity between this MS. and that of the Arsenal, described below, and he concludes that H comes from the same source as A

¹¹ Cf. *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale des Ducs de Bourgogne*, Bruxelles et Leipzig, 1842, Vol. I, p. cclix.

¹² *Romania*, XIV, 130.

¹³ *Histoire litt. de la France*, XXXIII, 348.

¹⁴ *Rom.*, XIV, 130 where a detailed description of this MS. is given.

and represents an earlier form. It is probable that MS. H belonged to the former library of Prince Henry which was sold in 1749. The *Vie de Sainte Eüphrosine* stands between *La Vie de Sainte Thaïs*¹⁵ fols. 53^r-61^r and *Les XV Signes* fols. 70^r-72^r.

The fourth MS., which we designate A, is No. 5204 of the Arsenal Library at Paris. It consists of 216 folios and in addition folios A and B. Four folios are lacking between 98 and 99 of the present numbering. It is 325 by 250 millimetres and is clearly written in a hand of the fourteenth century. It has three columns to the page and initials in red, blue and gold with the titles in red. There are 160 miniatures. According to a note on fol. 216 the volume once belonged to the collegiate church of S. Quentin en Vermandois.¹⁶ The version of our poem in this MS. comprises 1400 vv. and so is somewhat longer than in the MSS. described above. There is a miniature of the saint at the beginning and initials alternately in red and blue at the commencement of each tirade. Cloetta has discussed this MS. in his introduction to the *Poème Moral*, a part of which (*La Vie de Sainte Thaïs*) is found in fols. 78-87, directly preceding our poem. On the whole the writing is careless and there are many interpolations, some of which will be mentioned later. In the Introduction to his *Recueil* M. Paul Meyer has printed from this MS. the part of *La Vie de Sainte Eüphrosine* which corresponds to his extract from MS. O in pp. 334-338 of the same volume. He has designated by italics the verses that he thinks have been added by the copyist of A.

THE AUTHOR OF THE POEM AND HIS SOURCE

The name of the poet is not indicated, and a careful study of the text fails to throw much light on his identity. The principal source for information regarding the author is in the latter part of the poem, where the poet states that he found the story in a book and that on reading it he became so devoted to the saint that he decided to translate the account of her life. His purpose in doing so was

¹⁵ The existence of this MS. was overlooked by Cloetta in preparing his edition of the *Poème Moral*, of which *La Vie de Sainte Thaïs* forms a part. Cf. *Rom.*, XVI, 169.

¹⁶ For a more detailed description of MS. A, cf. *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibl. de l'Arsenal*, V, 152; cf. also *Romania*, XIII, 237.

not to change in any way the details of the biography, but rather to put it into a form through which it might become better known, in order that others as well as himself might find comfort in devotion to the saint. He fervently prays his patron to accept this service of his and implores her to intercede for him. He lays emphasis on the newness of his theme (vv. 1, 11) and asserts that, until he saw the book from which he made the translation, he had never heard of the story of Euphrosine and that even her name had been unknown to him.¹

From the fact that the author was able to translate the poem, one may be justified in assuming that he was a person of some education, probably a clerk or a monk, perhaps a Benedictine, since he makes Euphrosine enter that order (v. 439). That he was devout is shown by the fervor of his prayer, when he implores the intercession of the saint. In regard to his source the poet relates that he found the account written in a book where it was narrated in a simple form by the old clergy. On reading it he was moved to translate it *en romans*. From this we see that the poet had a Latin original.

Of the various Latin versions of the Life of Saint Euphrosine the one published from twelfth and fifteenth century MSS. in Rosweyd's *Vitae Patrum* 363 ff., Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 73, cols. 643-652 and *Acta Sanctorum*, Feb. 11, pp. 537-41 and which we shall designate as A has by far the closest resemblance to our poem. Most of the French poems dealing with the lives of saints treat the Latin sources with considerable freedom, often adding numerous picturesque details which serve to enliven the succinct account of the hagiographs.² They usually introduce conversations between the different personages and at times analyze motives and sentiments which find no mention in the original.

The poem which we are studying is no exception to the general rule. However the main outline of the Latin story is carefully followed and there are numerous cases³ where the poet made a literal

¹ It is noteworthy that the part of the poem in which these details occur is found only in MS. O, whereas the version of the other MSS. gives no information regarding the author.

² Cf. *La Vie de Saint Gilles par Guillaume de Berneville*, ed. by G. Paris and A. Bos, p. xxxvii.

³ Vv. 291-303, 336-339, 347, 354, 365, 395-405, 421-423, 542-5, 695, 846 f., 944 f., 947, 994-997, 1071-1079, 1092 f., 1109 f., 1126, 1136 f., 1144 f., 1245 f.

translation of the *Vita*. A careful comparison of these passages shows that the source of the French poem is the *Vita* and not any of the other Latin versions, since the latter do not present these verbal similarities. The sequence of the incidents narrated in the *Vita* has been carefully followed by the poet, except for the fact that in a few details the order has been slightly changed. In the three questions asked by Euphrosine at her first visit to the monastery (vv. 291-300) the third question of the Latin account becomes the second in the French and a more logical arrangement is thereby produced. Again when E. arrives seeking an asylum, she offers her purse and promises her heritage before she gives her name (vv. 538-549), whereas in the *Vita* the abbot speaks about her need of instruction before she makes the offer of gifts. As so often happens in poems of this *genre*, there are long prayers and exhortations frequently coupled with the citations of Biblical characters which have no counterpart in the Latin source (vv. 66-80, 177-200, 221-240, 311-320, 476-483, 602-653). Besides the poet has a fondness for laments which he usually has expanded (vv. 684-722, 737-773, 1046-1069, 1145-1178). At times he introduces certain little touches which enliven the narrative and show that he does not confine himself entirely to his model. Such are the references to the commercial activity of the monks who work hard but give their profits to charity (vv. 366-372), the list of garments when E. changes her nun's garb for the habiliments of a knight (vv. 494-500), the burial preparations after E.'s death (vv. 1189-1208) and the beginning of the legend (vv. 1229-1238). Occasionally the poet dilates upon a detail in truly mediaeval fashion as in the explanation of the name of Esmerade (vv. 444-453). In one instance (vv. 664-722) he has departed somewhat from the *Vita*. This occurs at the point where Paphnutius discovers his daughter's flight from home. According to the poem the father goes to the house of her fiancé and bitterly accuses him and his father, while in the Latin he remains at home and sends servants to acquaint them of his loss and there is no accusation. There is no doubt that by this change the poet has succeeded in portraying the grief of the aged parent with a poignant vividness which is not found in the Latin.

In these points of divergence between the poem and the *Vita*

there is a complete harmony in the four MSS. of our text. However in one instance MS. O includes an incident found in the *Vita* but not in the other three MSS. of the French version. This is the reference to the fact that after E.'s death her father retires to the cell which she had occupied for 38 years and lies on the same mattress which she had used (vv. 1245, 6). The concluding strophes which explain how the poet happened to select this theme for his work and his own deep devotion to Saint Euphrosine are naturally absent from the *Vita*. It is interesting to note that this *Vita* differs from the other Latin versions, in that it contains numerous dialogues and soliloquies and these are frequently translated by the French poet and occasionally expanded.

OTHER VERSIONS OF THE LIFE OF SAINT EUPHROSINE

Besides the *Vita* (A) which has been described and shown to be the source of the French poem, there are several other versions preserved in Latin.

B. *Vita* published by Anatole Boucherie⁴ from MS. 55 of *l'Ecole de Médecine* of Montpellier originally from St. Etienne of Autun. The MS. contains a collection of Saints' lives compiled during the ninth century and is interesting for a study of Late Latin forms. The Life of Saint E. found in this MS. reproduces in general the order and content of (A). In many cases however the vocabulary is different, while in no instance does it present a closer resemblance to the poem than does (A). Moreover in certain of the cases² where there is a close verbal similarity between (A) and the poem, there is no such parallelism in (B), from which it is evident that (B) is not the direct source of the French poet,⁵ although it is the earliest extant version, perhaps antedating the ninth century.⁶

⁴ *Revue des langues romanes*, II, 26-40.

⁵ Vv. 206, 300-303, 329, 364, 5, 913-917, 936, 975-980, 994-997, 997-1003, 1046-77, 1080-1104 have correspondences in A but not in B. The long speech of Euphrosine in chap. XV, V. P., which is more or less reproduced in the poem is omitted in B. Special verses which resemble A and not B are: 507 *Et at pris cin cens solz*; A *quingentos solidos*; B *quingaginta solidos*—520 according to the poem the abbot goes out to see E.; A *Egresso autem abbate*; B *et ordinavit abbas introducere illum*.—1126 the *ora pro me* of the poem occurs also in A, but there is nothing similar in B.

⁶ Cf. *Analecta Bollandiana*, II, 195 ff.

C. *Vita* published in Mombricitus, *Sanctuarium*, Paris, 1910, vol. I, pp. 450-454. This account is much the same as that in the *Vitae Patrum*, but it does not resemble the French poem so closely. Euphrosine's speech to her father, when he comes to visit her in her cell, is practically omitted. The number of monks in the convent (342) agrees with the poem. The name of the father is always given as Panfutius. On p. 660 a comparison is made with the *Vita* publ. by Rosweyd and some of the variants are noted.

D. *Vita* publ. in *Bibliotheca Casinensis* III, *Florilegium*, pp. 221-225. This follows (A) in outline but not verbally. It is more condensed except in the latter part beginning with the lament of Paphnutius after his daughter's death. The realistic proof of identity by the washing of the naked body is emphasized. The text does not correspond to the poem as closely as does that of (A).

E. A metrical Latin life in 800 vss. is preserved in an old codex of the Monastery of St. Maximin at Trèves according to the preface to the *Vitae* published in A.S. Feb. 11, pp. 537, where a brief extract is cited.

The Latin lives were in turn derived from the Greek. One Greek Life is ascribed to Simeon Metaphrastes who wrote during the tenth century. The Greek text with a Latin translation by Gentianus Hervetus may be found in Migne's *Patrologia graeca*, vol. 114, cols. 305-322. The Latin translation is printed also in *Acta Sanctorum*, Feb. 11, pp. 541 ff.; Lippomani, *Vitae Priscorum Patrum* VI, 25 Sept.; Surius, *Vitae Sanctorum*, Jan. 1, 43 ff. The account does not include all the details of (A) which have been reproduced in the poem. Besides it has certain extraneous incidents such as chap. VI, which relates how Euphrosine ceased to care for her person after returning from her visit to the monastery. On the whole this form of the story is more philosophical and rational, as is frequently the case with the versions that claim Metaphrastes as author.

An epitome in Greek containing only the salient points of the legend is found in the *Menologium*⁷ collected by the order of the Emperor Basil II before 984. The outline differs from the other versions only in limiting Euphrosine's stay in the monastery to 18 years, whereas the other accounts have 38.

⁷ Published in Migne; *Patr. gr.*, CXVII, 71.

Later versions of the Life of Saint Euphrosine are as follows:— In French: a prose translation from the Latin in the collection of *Vies des Pères* made for Blanche, Countess of Champagne, widow of Thibaud III. This is preserved in five MSS., in two of which it is abridged. For list of MSS. cf. *Hist. litt. de la France*, XXXIII, 307, 314, 442.—A different version in a fifteenth century MS. (*Bibl. Royale de Belgique* 10295–10304). According to Paul Meyer this account is unique. Cf. *Hist. litt.*, XXXIII, 439 and *Rom.*, XXX, 305.—Gabr. Brosse: *Histoire abrégée de la vie et de la translation de sainte Euphrosine, vierge d'Alexandrie, patronne de l'abbaye de Reaulieu lez Compiègne*; Paris, 1649.—*Histoire abrégée de la vie et de la translation de sainte Euphrosine, vierge d'Alexandrie, patronne du prieuré de Saint-Louis de Royallieu dans la forêt de Compiègne, avec l'office*; Reims, 1666.—*Le triomphe de la grâce sur la nature dans la vie admirable de l'ill. vierge sainte Euphrosine patronne de l'abbaye royale de Royal-Lieu-les-Compiègne, en vers français*; Paris, 1672.—*Vie admirable de sainte Euphrosine tirée des auteurs anciens et traduite en français par un religieux bénédictin*, Paris, 1649. This is dedicated to Gabrielle Albaspina, Abbess of Reaulieu-lez-Compiègne, where several relics of the saint were preserved.⁸

In Italian: *La Istoria de Sancta Eufrosina virgine*, a prose account found in a MS. dating from the beginning of the fifteenth century and now in the library of Professor Suchier. This version has been printed by Kar Kümmell (*Drei italienische Prosalegenden*, Halle, 1906). It faithfully reproduces the order and content of (A), of which it is an adaptation rather than a translation—*Leggenda o Storia di Santa Aufrosina*. Poem in 132 strophes. MS. *Biblioteca dell' Università di Bologna*, no. 158. The MS. is of the fourteenth or fifteenth century according to Prof. Veggetti.⁹ For this note I am indebted to Professor Kenneth McKenzie.—*La rappresentatione di sancta Eufrosina vergine con duc laude*, Florence 1572 and 1585. One of a series of *rappresentationi* printed at Flor-

⁸ According to the Bollandists relics of the saint were also to be found at Saint Etienne of Boulogne-sur-mer and at a Carthusian monastery near Sierk on the Moselle. It is the hope of the editor to make a study of the survival of the cult of Saint Euphrosine in France.

⁹ Cf. *Il Libro della cucina, Sceltà di curiosità*, 40.

ence by Chiti in the last part of the sixteenth century.—*Santa Eufrosina, poemetto sacro di Filippo Alfonsi*, Roma, 1702—*Santa Eufrosina, oratorio da cantarsi in Perugia, di un pastore Arcade* (D. Tommaso Giannini), Perugia, 1713.

In Catalan: prose translation in a collection made by Ramon Ros de Tarraga, circ. 1320 (Cf. Gröber's *Grundriss* II, 2, 91).

In Portuguese: a literal prose translation of the *Vita* which we have called A. This is preserved in MS. 266 (fourteenth century), formerly of the library of the convent of Alcobaça, now at Torre de Tombo, Lisbon. Published by Cornu in *Romania*, XI, 357 ff. In this MS. as in MS. O of our poem the Life of Saint Euphrosine is immediately followed by that of Sancta Maria Aegyptica. Cf. *Romania*, XVIII, 218.

In German: the version of the *Veterbûch*. Fragments have been published by Roth (*Denkmäler der deutschen Sprache*) from a MS. of the first half of the thirteenth century and by Zingerle (*Wiener Sitzungsberichte*, vol. 64), from a fourteenth century MS.

There has been considerable uncertainty regarding the exact date of S. Euphrosine's life. According to the statement found at the beginning of the *Vita* ascribed to Simeon Metaphrastes (*Cum Romanorum sceptro Theodosius Arcadii filius pie regeret, vir quidam*, etc.) the saint was not born before 408, the date of the death of Arcadius. As she was eighteen years of age, when she entered the monastery and spent thirty-eight years there, the date of her death would be probably about 470, cf. *Acta Sanctorum*, Feb., p. 536. In the *Vita* on which the French poem is based the name of Theodosius occurs but twice. In the first case, it is after the departure of Paphnutius for the monastery, when E. sends a servant to summon a monk to counsel her and bids him *vade in monasterium Theodosii*. The phrase is translated in all the MSS. of the poem. In *Vita* (B) the sentence reads: *Vade in ecclesia quem construxit Theodosius imperatur*. This shows that it is the emperor and not the abbot that is meant. However the version of *Vita* (A) may have given the French poet the name of the abbot who is anonymous in the *Vitae*. The second case occurs in a speech in which the abbot tries to console Paphnutius (*Vis colloquium habere cum uno Fratre spirituali qui venit de palatio Theodosii*. Here the ref-

erence is obviously to the emperor. This phrase with a few changes occurs in *Vita* (B) and *Vita* (C). In the French poem (v. 524) E. announces herself in these words: *Canbrelains del palais Teodoise ai esté*. It should be noted that this reading is found only in MS. O, but since the other MSS. have versions which are metrically (BH) or grammatically (A) incorrect, there is no reason to doubt the correctness of O.¹⁰ From the above citations it is evident that the Greek and Latin versions of the story assigned Euphrosine to the age of Theodosius. Is it Theodosius the Great or his grandson who is referred to? It would be natural to infer that the former was meant, were it not for the explicit statement at the beginning of the *Vita* ascribed to Metaphrastes. Since we have no further historical testimony, it is impossible to decide the problem. However E. must have lived in the first part of the fifth century, since Theodosius the Great did not begin to reign until 379 and as she spent 38 years in the convent, she could not have died before 417, whereas, if the statement of Metaphrastes is correct, she probably lived until about 470. It is evident in any case that neither the date of 394 found in one MS. (cf. *Acta Sanc.*, Feb., pp. 535 f.) nor that of 400 given by Marc Antoine Alegræus as the date of her death is authentic.

Furthermore the authorities do not agree upon the date assigned to her in the Church calendar. In that of the Roman Church it is January 1, whereas in the Greek calendar it is September 25, and according to the records of the Carmelites it is February 11, the date used in the *Acta Sanctorum*.

The original Life was probably written not long after the death of the saint. From this original Greek copies were made and from these were translated the Latin versions, one of which has been shown to be the source of the French poem.

RAYMOND T. HILL

YALE UNIVERSITY

¹⁰ It is noteworthy that in the two passages where the name of the emperor is given, MS. O has *Teodoise*, whereas the name of the abbot is always written *Teodose*, *Theodose* or *Theodosius*.

(To be continued)

MISCELLANEOUS

HISPANIC NOTES: *azar*; *aziago*; **B** for **U**.

AZAR.—Erly Catalan chanjed *dz* after a vouel to the dental fricativ *ð*, hwich became *v* az a final and waz lost between vouels: *feu* < **fev* < **feð* < **fedz* < *fecit*, *veina* < **vedina* < **vedzina* < *uicina*. Modern Catalan has *dz* (commonly speld *tz*) for ôlder *ddz*, az in *dotze* < **dodedze*; and also in words borrod from Spanish, az *atzar* < *azar*, *atzerola* < *azerola*, *atzur* = *azul*. Such loan-words ar ov interest with regard to Spanish fonolojy: they wer borrod at a time hwen *dz* waz uzed in spôken Spanish corresponding to ritn *z*, and after Catalan *dz* had become *ð*.

AZIAGO.—Meyer-Lübke explains Spanish *aciago* az a derivativ ov *aegyptiacus*, in his Romanic dictionery. He has ôverlookt Portugees *aziago*, with the voist sound *z* hwich cannot reprezent *ti* after a consonant. *Aziago* comes from the stem ov *acidus*, combined with the suffix seen in *embriago*: **acidâcus*.

B for U.—It iz wel known that English speech has somtimes bin corrupted by faulty spelling: exampls ar *advance* (< *ab-ante* . . .) and *anthem* (< *antefn*). So too the formerly silent *l* ov *fault* (< *faute*) iz perhaps parcialy artificial, tho it may also hav come from the influence ov historic *l* in *false*. The simpl sound-sistem ov erly Spanish did not ofn permit such developments, but in a feu names we find *u* chanjed to *v* under the influence ov defectiv spelling. Thus *Ivâñez* iz prezumably derived from **Iohannici*: ritn *Iuannez* (for *Juannez*) waz mis-red with *iv*, befoar the grafic distinccions ov *i-j* and *u-v* wer establisht. *Pavlo* iz evidently a corrupcion ov bookish *Paulo* (=Portugees *Paulo*), cauzd by the rarity ov spôken *au* in erly Spanish. It may be suspected that *Uvaldo* iz a grafic alteracion ov *Waldo*; a Spaniard has informd me that ritn *Waldo* iz regularly mis-red in acordance with the other spelling. Nouadays thees names ar ritn with *b*: *Ibâñez*, *Pablo*, *Ubaldo*.

E. H. TUTTLE

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

ETYMOLOGIES AND ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES¹1. RUMANIAN *ageat*

THIS word, which takes also the forms *agit* and *aged*, is translated in the Dictionary of the Rumanian Academy (Vol. I, pt. I, p. 67) as "désir, envie, disposition (à faire ggch)." The authors of that dictionary record merely that the etymology is unknown, tacitly rejecting the derivation from Latin *agito* (cf. *cuget* < *cogito* = *co* + *agito*) which seems to have been sponsored by Hasdeu (in *Etymologicum Magnum Romaniae*, vol. I, column 502, where the accent is wrongly placed on the first syllable). In reality the word is Turkish *hâjet* (< Arabic *hâjat*, "anything necessary, requisite; want, need; necessity; object; utensil; desire, wish"²), which, like its Rumanian reflex, is applied to felt needs. Thus Rumanian *mî-e* (or *am*) *ageat să . . .* 'I want to,' finds an exact counterpart in (Vulgar) Turkish *hâjetim var (dîr)*.

2. RUMANIAN *asturcan*

The Dictionary of the Academy (Vol. I, pt. I, p. 334) explains this word (which occurs also as *astrucan* and *asturcon*) as "(cheval) de race perse" and says its etymology is unknown. In this case we have to deal with a word of classical origin, directly modelled on Latin *asturco*, 'Asturian horse' (found in Pliny the Elder, Petronius, etc.). The definition of the Academy is wrong in part, inasmuch as the term is not limited to Persian horses. It goes without saying that this is a learned word, and not one of Folk Latin origin.

3. RUMANIAN *buflea*, *buflis*

The Dictionary of the Academy (Vol. I, part I, p. 676) enters under the one heading *buf* several words differing from one another in form, in meaning and, in some cases at least, in origin. The filiation of these words is all the more difficult to trace inasmuch as, both semantically and phonologically, they have contaminated one another. In the present writer's belief, however, the

¹ Continued from ROMANIC REVIEW, IX, 313-316. Full bibliographical indications previously given are not here repeated.

² F. Steingass, *The Student's Arabic-English Dictionary*, London, 1884, p. 257.

word *buflîş* ('dumpy, squabby; humpty-dumpty') is etymologically distinct and is derived directly from Transylvanian German *Bâflîsch* or *Bqflêsch*. The dialectal German word (= H. G. *Backfleisch* < *Bache(n)*, cognate with O. F. *bacon*, whence our *bacon*), besides its original meaning of 'flitch of bacon,' is applicable to fat persons (*Siebenbürgisch-Sächsisches Wörterbuch*, Vol. I, p. 374), as in Rumanian. The Rumanian variant *buflea* is easily explained on the assumption that the ending *-îş* (*-eş*) in *buflîş* was felt to be a suffix and as such replaced by *-ea*, a suffix formative of proper names with a pejorative tinge.

4. RUMANIAN *dichiciu*

This rare word found in the writings of Ioan Creangă ("şanuri, calupuri, astrăgaciū, bedreag, dichiciū," apud Tiktin, *Rumänisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Vol. II, p. 544) is explained as 'a sort of knife for leather' by Professor Tiktin, according to whom its etymology is unknown. It is the same as Hungarian *dikis* (pronounced *dikiş*), 'paring knife,' with change of suffix and consequently of accent. The Hungarian word was adopted as *dikisch*, "Zuschneidemesser des Tschismenmachers (ohne Griff)"⁸ in the so-called Nösensch, the dialect of the German settlers around the town of Bistritz.

5. RUMANIAN *fărmac*

According to the Academy Dictionary (*s. v.*) this is a Moldavian measure of length equivalent to about .44 cm. The derivation from *fărâmă*, 'morsel, crumb' + the suffix *-ac* is so obvious (cf. *palmac* < Turkish *parmak*, interpreted by the people as *palmă* + *-ac*) that it is surprising to read the statement in the Academy Dictionary that the etymology is unknown. It is possible that, here too, the editors were apprehensive of popular etymology. Yet even in scientific metrology a unit of measure may be derived from a word connoting smallness. Thus Greek *μικρόν* gives us *micron*, 'the thousandth part of one millimeter.' Compare also Modern Greek *λεπτόν*, 'a minute (of time and circumference),' in Late Greek 'a small coin,' literally 'a peel' (from *λέπω*, 'I peel'); and our *minute*.

⁸ G. Kisch, *Nösner Wörter und Wendungen*. . . . Bistritz, 1900, p. 33.

6. RUMANIAN *obligeană*

Like many other Rumanian names of plants, *obligeană* or *abligeană* ('the galangal' or 'galingale') is derived from the Turkish language, in which the plant is named *khovlinjan*. The Turkish word itself is borrowed from the Persian, into which it is supposed to have come from the Chinese, as the species is a native of the Far East. Curiously enough English *galangal* (*galingale*) is cognate with the Rumanian word, since it is ultimately derived from *Khālanjān*, another form of the Arabic (Turkish and Persian) word. (See *The Oxford Dictionary*.) Whether *obligeană* is also the name of another aromatic, the sweet flag (*Acorus calamus*), as given by Tiktin (*Rumänisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Vol. II, p. 1071), to the exclusion of the meaning given above, the present writer does not know. The two plants, to be sure, are similar in several respects, both as to appearance and use.

FELICIU VEXLER

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

JODELLE AND COLET

IN reprinting poems written by Jodelle in honor of his friend Claude Colet, neither of the former's modern editors¹ has referred to the prose preface² that accompanies one of them, though it contains information about the tastes and opinions of both these poets.

Facts about Colet have been collected chiefly by La Croix du

¹ Marty-Laveaux, *La Pléiade française, les œuvres et meslanges poétiques d'Estienne Jodelle sieur du Lymodin*, Paris, Alphonse Lemerre, 1868, 1870, 2 vols., 8°; and Ad. Van Bever, *Les Amours et autres poésies d'Estienne Jodelle sieur du Lymodin*, Paris, E. Sansot et Cie, 1907, 8°.

² The preface is mentioned by Brunet and in the catalogues of the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale. It is published with a French and a Latin poem as an introduction to *L'Histoire Palladienne traitant des gestes et genereux faitz d'armes et d'amours de plusieurs grands princes et seigneurs, spécialement de Palladien filz du roy Milanor d'Angleterre et de la belle Selerine sœur du Roy de Portugal; nouvellement mise en nostre Vulgaire François, par feu Cl. Colet Champenois*, Paris, 1555, f°, printed by Grouleau, some copies pour Ian Dallier, others pour Vincent Serteuas; reprinted at Antwerp, 1562, 4°, and again at Paris, 1573, 8°.

Maine³ and the Abbé Goujet.⁴ He was born near Troyes, at Rumilly, was known as poet, orator, and "maître d'hôtel de Madame la Marquise de Nesle." He was on friendly terms not only with Jodelle, but with Marot, Muret, d'Aurigny, Olivier de Magny, Pasquier.⁵ His first work, *l'Oraison de Mars aux dames de la court*, was published in 1544⁶ and, in enlarged form, in 1548.⁷ It contains versified harangues in praise of war and of peace, followed by a number of epigrammes, elegies, and epistles, in some of which Goujet detects a talent for satire. He subsequently devoted himself mainly to translation, publishing fragments of *Clitophon and Leucippe*⁸ and the ninth book of *Amadis*.⁹ The *Histoire Pallasienne*, already mentioned, appeared after his death. An *Histoire Æthiopique d'Héliodore*, Paris, 1549, 8°, is assigned to him by Rigoley de Juvigny.¹⁰ Other productions are referred to when Colet informs a friend that manuscripts have been stolen from him,¹¹ and when Jodelle, in his preface to the *Histoire Pallasienne*, declares that Colet has written works "plus doctes et plus profitables que ne sont les Romants." Of his death it has been merely stated that he must have lived as late as 1553. Jodelle's evidence fixes the date by referring in the same preface, written in 1555,¹² to his friend's having died two years before.

In spite of Colet's interest in romances, which to an enthusiastic humanist like Jodelle made him seem a continuer of the middle ages, and notwithstanding the difference there must have been

³ Rigoley de Juvigny, *les Bibliothèques françoises de La Croix du Maine et de Du Verdier*, Paris, 1772, i, 134 and iii, 329.

⁴ *Bibliothèque françoise*, Paris, 1741-1756, vol. xi, pp. 165, 178-184, vol. xii, p. 25.

⁵ Poems by Magny and Pasquier are published with Colet's translation of *Amadis*.

⁶ Paris, Chr. Wechel, 4°.

⁷ Paris, Chr. Wechel, 8°.

⁸ *Les deuis amoureux*, Paris, Gilles Corrozet, 1545, 8°; cf. Graesse, *loc. cit.*

⁹ *Le neufiesme liure d'Amadis de Gaule*, Paris, Vincent Serteuas, 1553, f°. Graesse, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 94, puts the first edition in 1552, and agrees with LaCroix du Maine that Colet merely corrected this translation, originally made by Gilles Boileau.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 134. Is this Amyot's translation, one edition of which appeared in 1549?

¹¹ Cf. Goujet, *op. cit.*, vol. xi, p. 182.

¹² The *achevé d'imprimer* is dated September 20.

between their ages, for Colet's *Oraison* was published when Jodelle was only twelve years old, his charm of manner so attracted the younger poet that the latter left all pleasant company for his. Discussions over the value of the novels Colet was translating provoked Jodelle's vigorous criticism. He considered them "moysis à demy," "menteries espagnoles," "entrelassez de mile auantures aussi peu vray-semblables que vrayes," "la resuerie de nos peres, la corruption de nostre ieunesse, la perte du temps, le iargon des valetz de boutique, le tesmoignage de nostre ignorance." It is easy to make Amadis talk, yet for such amusements intelligent men in France are giving up eloquence and philosophy, though these have been only half treated by the ancients.

Colet answered this diatribe with familiar arguments of precedent and utility, citing the usage of Heliodorus, Apuleius, Homer, Vergil, Ariosto, the Greek orators, arguing that there is truth in fiction, that recitals of combats encourage youths, that a pleasant tale teaches more effectively than history, especially in the case of nobles, who avoid other forms of mental discipline. Jodelle, temporarily convinced, seeing one day Colet's translation of *Amadis* lying ready for the press, dictated to him an "ode François de gayeté de cuer et sus le pié, comme i'ay de coustume."¹³ It is thus poem which was published with the *Amadis* and now figures in Marty-Laveaux's edition of Jodelle.¹⁴ It makes an appeal to Colet to work on in spite of public neglect. Jodelle, though only twenty-one, forgetful of the recent success of his *Cléopâtre*, feels that he, too, is not appreciated:

Ne sçais-tu pas que i'emprisonne
Les graces que le ciel me donne
Dessous vn silence obstiné?
Bien que ie sente en moy la gloire
Et Poétique et Oratoire:

¹³ A confirmation of Charles de la Mothe's statement: "Tout ce que l'on voit et que l'on verra composé par Jodelle n'a jamais esté fait que promptement, sans estude et sans labeur. . . . Nous luy avons veu en sa premiere adolescence composer et escrire en une seule nuict, par gageure, cinq cens bons vers latins, sur le sujet que promptement ou luy bailloit." Cf. Van Bever, *op. cit.*, p. 29 n.

¹⁴ Vol. ii, pp. 208-211.

Bien que le Ciel m'ayt destiné
 Pour plus haulte philosophie
 Et bien que, braue, ie me fie
 D'estre au monde heureusement né.

However neglectful the public may have been, Colet was so highly pleased with his friend's effusion that he asked him to write something to accompany his *Histoire Palladienne*. A bargain was struck. Jodelle agreed to write an introductory poem for this romance; Colet promised that after its publication he would devote himself to more substantial things.

Thus it happened that when, two years after Colet's death, the publishers brought out the book, Jodelle found himself obliged to contribute not only the introductory poem, but a preface explaining why he should thus associate his name with a romance after having made fun "en mille bonnes compagnies de ce fabuleux genre d'escrire," which serves only "d'amusement ou d'espouventail aux indoctes." His apology for his friend and himself covers four folio pages, although he tells us that long prefaces are as useless as Ionic or Doric porches before a barn. These pages are largely filled with the explanations and characterizations I have summarized. The candor with which he refers to Colet's romance is remarkable, if not unique, among prefaces to a dead friend's work. He would not praise the book "si fort qu'on disoit bien, mais pour prier affectueusement toute la France de le traiter le plus doucement qu'elle pourra." If they will deal kindly with this romance, they will soon have a rich reward, for in return Jodelle will consent to hasten the publication of his own works, so long awaited by the reader.

In the meanwhile he publishes with the *Histoire Palladienne* his ode "Aux Cendres de Claude Colet,"¹⁵ and a Latin epitaph treating in language none too delicate the delicate question whether Colet's death by the plague was due to his labor or his love. As Marty-Laveaux and Van Bever make no reference to this production, I reprint it in full:

¹⁵ Reprinted by Marty-Laveaux, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 211-213; Van Bever, *op. cit.*, pp. 206-208.

C. COLETII MANES

Qui Traecis oriundus eram,¹⁶ qui natus in agro
Rumilio, vixi doctus, inops perij,
Vita satis nota est, vitam abstulit inuida pestis,
Pestis Amor causa est, vel mihi causa labor:
Dira lues aderat, poteram fugisse, Cupido,
Vel solitus potuit me tenuisse labor.
Ergo meo carmen tumulto sic sorte legendum est,
Vel forte inuerso carmine verus ero.
HUNC LABOR HAND AMOR HUNC, MENS HAEC
NON MENTULA, PALLAS
SEDLA NON PETULANS HINC VENUS ERIPVIT.
Iodelius P.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

AMHERST COLLEGE

¹⁶ Sprung from the Trecae, the Gallic tribe from whom Troyes derives its name.

REVIEWS

La Vie de Sainte Enimie, Bertran de Marseille, poème provençal du XIII^e siècle édité par Clovis Brunel, 1917. Paris: Champion.

L'unique manuscrit de la *Vie de Sainte Enimie* se trouve à la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal; il est écrit d'une même main et date de la première moitié du XIV^e siècle, mais des particularités de langue et de facture (par exemples désinences en *-er* ou *-eyra*—plus tard *-ier*, *-ieyra*—qui ne se rencontrent plus dès le milieu du XIII^e siècle, et encore la troisième personne du pluriel *voun* qui disparaît après le XII^e) démontrent que le poème appartient à une date antérieure. Cependant la déclinaison régulièrement observée (sauf dans deux cas où le cas régime se substitue au cas sujet), et les secondes personnes du pluriel en *-t*, établissent que l'œuvre ne fut pas composée avant le début du XIII^e siècle—époque à laquelle les pluriels en *-es* apparaissent et où fléchissent les rigueurs de la déclinaison. On peut donc attribuer de façon certaine le début du XIII^e siècle comme date de la composition de ce curieux morceau de poésie provençale au Moyen-Age.

Le récit est emprunté à un texte latin anonyme écrit dans les premières années du XII^e siècle, *Acta sanctae virginis Enimae* raconte la vie, l'invention du corps et les miracles d'une certaine vierge Enimie qu'une généalogie fantaisiste présente comme descendante de Clovis, premier roi chrétien de la France. Enimie se voit obligée au mariage par son père bien qu'elle ait résolu de consacrer à Dieu sa virginité. Dans ce péril elle sollicite l'intervention divine et devient lépreuse. Plus tard un ange lui apparaît et lui ordonne de se baigner dans la fontaine de Burla en Gévaudan. Elle obéit et la lèpre disparaît, mais la maladie la reprend chaque fois qu'elle tente de s'éloigner du lieu de sa guérison. Dès lors elle y vit solitaire dans une caverne du causse de Sauveterre. Elle entreprend de construire une abbaye; un dragon dévaste les chantiers jusqu'à ce que l'évêque Hilarus l'ait contraint à se précipiter dans le fleuve. Enimie meurt abbesse du monastère. Son frère Dagobert veut la faire enterrer à Saint-Denis, mais au lieu du cercueil de la sainte, on emporte ce lui de sa filleule et les restes de l'abbesse demeurèrent à Sainte Eminie; leur présence est révélée plus tard miraculeusement.

Tels sont les faits de la légende dont Bertran de Marseille composa un poème narratif de 2000 vers octosyllabiques à rimes plates qui deviennent dans quelques cas de simples assonances. L'auteur suit l'ordre de la vie latine et la traduit exactement en maints passages. Il y ajoute cependant certains détails, dont la légende s'est sans doute enrichie depuis l'origine: c'est entre autres le miracle de la pierre qui a moulé les hanches de la sainte sur le rocher, ou encore le cas où pour expliquer une tache sur la paroi l'auteur suppose que le dragon y fut blessé.

Bertran de Marseille allège le texte latin de ses allusions bibliques et de toute digression savante. Par des citations de proverbes, l'emploi de locutions populaires et l'usage du discours direct il donne de la vie à son poème, et la

chaude et naïve langue provençale achève de tranformer la lourdeur du texte latin.

A. DE VILLÈLE

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE

Cecco d'Ascoli: *L'Acerba, con prefazione, note e bibliografia di Pasquale Rosario*. Lanciano, R. Carabba, 1916. "Scrittori Nostri," No. 58.

The above edition will be welcomed by all students of the work of Francesco Stabili, better known by the less formal title of Cecco d'Ascoli. For, in furnishing a complete text of the *Acerba*, Sig. Rosario has rendered a real contribution to the study of that picturesque and ill-fated contemporary of Dante who at the stake so gallantly confirmed his revolutionary doctrines with the words: "l'ho detto, l'ho insegnato, e lo credo." Ever since the announcement of a critical edition of this work, first by Bariola, later by Castelli, scholars have awaited vainly the fulfilment of these promises. In the meantime the text of the *Acerba* has become more and more difficult of access, even in the most modern of the hitherto printed editions, that of 1820 in Venice, included in Andreola's "Parnaso italiano,"—a text described by Carlo Lozzi as "arbitrariamente ammodernato e racconciato."¹

The task of Sig. Rosario has been less ambitious than that of his predecessors, to whose scholarship and industry he pays a generous tribute. But it has been brought, for that very reason, to a prompt conclusion. He believes in the originality and in the enduring interest of the *Acerba*, and that the first step towards a critical edition of this work, if such a thing be possible, lies in the presentation of an adequate text, accessible even to the ordinary reader. The present number of the "Scrittori Nostri" series makes no other claim than this.

"Non è, nè poteva essere," says Sig. Rosario in his introduction, "un testo critico esauriente dell' *Acerba*: è un' edizione nuova, mai tentata per lo innanzi, per quanto possibile, fedele, eseguita sui due codici e, sopra tutto, accessibile anche alla coltura popolare." And again: "Gli studi non sono tuttora completi per un retto giudizio scientifico; e la lettura integrale del lavoro cecciano servirà per l'appunto, ad agevolarne l' indagine. Questo soltanto è il nostro scopo."

Of the two codices above mentioned one, the Cod. Mediceo-Laurenziano N. 52, pl. XL, "cum icone auctoris in principio ad vivum expressa,"² dates from the fourteenth century and has been considered by all investigators to be the least corrupt and most authoritative MS. of the *Acerba*. It lacks, however, the fragmentary fifth Book, which Sig. Rosario has supplied, together with "qualche integrazione di concetto o di forma," from a fifteenth century MS., hitherto unpublished, viz., Cod. No. 82 of the Biblioteca Casanatense in Rome. Why this Codex has been chosen, rather than some other fourteenth century MS., such as the Laurentian Cod. Ashburnh. 1223, in which the text of the *Acerba* is also complete, the author does not state in his Introduction. But it is interesting to note that, linguistically considered, the MSS. chosen belong to distinct groups, the Laurentian Codex showing Venetian forms, while the Casanatense MS. contains many words belonging to the southern dialects. Sig. Rosario has given

¹ C. Lozzi, *Cecco d'Ascoli, saggio critico e bibliografico*, Firenze, 1903.

² Bandini, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, Tomus V.

an exact reprint of the MSS., with a few slight exceptions. The abbreviations have been expanded; punctuation and orthographic signs have been inserted. Some of the Venetian forms peculiar to the Laurentian Codex have not been retained, some obvious metrical corrections have been made, and the use of the letter "h" has been made to conform with modern usage. The preface, besides outlining the method and scope of this edition, states briefly the chief problems which arise in the study of Cecco d'Ascoli's life and work, and offers at the end a hitherto unpublished Latin document (discovered by Sig. Rosario in the State Archives of Naples), affording evidence that from the 12th of March to the 31st of May, 1327, Cecco was at the court of Duke Charles of Calabria at Florence, in the quality of "phiscus et familiaris." From this the editor concludes that the latter date marks the beginning of Cecco's downfall—a catastrophe culminating in two month's confinement in the Inquisitorial prisons of Santa Croce, in Cecco's second conviction, and in his execution in September of the same year. Sig. Rosario also promises for an early date the publication of further documents from the same source, shedding light in particular on Cecco's political career and its probable relation to his condemnation and death.

A rich bibliographical apparatus constitutes one of the most valuable features of this edition, the material being listed under four separate bibliographies. Of these the first contains descriptions of all the codices of the *Acerba* to be found in the Italian libraries, mention being made of those known to exist in Paris and in Berlin, with references to the Hamburg MS. cited by Bariola and to the MS. which Amador de Los Ríos states was made in Italy in the fifteenth century by López de Mendoza, marqués de Santillana, under the title of "De proprietatibus rerum", the whereabouts of which is now unknown. The second bibliography offers descriptions of the printed texts of the *Acerba*, from the first folio edition in Brescia by Ferrando in 1475(?)—(no example of which is now known to exist)—to that of Venice, 1820, mentioned above. Of these twenty-five editions, ten belong to the fifteenth century, fourteen to the sixteenth, the latter all containing the commentary to the first two books by Nicola Massetti of Modena. The third bibliography contains a list of Cecco's Latin works, with critical comments, as in the case of the previous bibliographies. In this list are included the "tre lettere giocose" held to be spurious by Castelli and by Rossi. The last bibliography consists of a remarkably complete array of books and articles useful for the study of Cecco's life and work. Here, a re-listing of the titles on an alphabetical or chronological basis would greatly facilitate consultation.

Of the foot-notes to his text of the *Acerba* Sig. Rosario speaks as follows: "Qualche noticina abbiám voluto mettere quà e là, per gli opportuni raffronti con altre opere o pei necessari richiami, alieni da ogni pretesa di commento diplomatico, letterario o scientifico." In spite of this modest disclaimer, these foot-notes furnish much valuable material. They not only point out the differences in reading and arrangement of the two MSS. utilized and collated, but they also reproduce the Latin rubrics of the books and chapters of the Laurentian codex; most valuable of all, they indicate many parallels between the *Acerba* and the works of Cecco's contemporaries, thus pointing the way to a more exhaustive critical study.

Of all the questions connected with Cecco's dramatic career, none is more

vitally interesting than that of his personal relations with the great contemporary poets, Dante, Cino da Pistoia and Petrarch, to the first two of whom many references occur in the pages of the *Acerba*.³ As Cecco's connection with Dante in particular has naturally been the subject of repeated discussion, Sig. Rosario has printed in an appendix the six Italian sonnets attributed to Cecco which complete that author's work in the vernacular and which are closely related to the *Acerba*. Of these sonnets the second and third are addressed to Cino, the fourth to Dante, and the fifth and sixth to Petrarch. The first treats of the philosopher's stone. The edition ends with an index indicating the structure and contents of the *Acerba*.

Whatever opinion one may hold of the literary, or scientific, or moral value of the *Acerba*, Sig. Rosario's position is well taken when he says in his preface:

"La fama di cui godè in vita l'autore, le edizioni che con frequenza si son succedute dai primordi quasi dell'arte della stampa ci dimostrano che qualche cosa di originale e di nuovo vi deve pur essere nell' *Acerba*."

And no one who is familiar with the work will deny that it is a document full of interest for the student of Italian culture in the fourteenth century. That this feeling was shared by Cecco's contemporaries, and by the early editors of his work, it quaintly expressed in the sonnet inscribed by Massetti at the beginning of his commentary, mentioned above:

Se ben aparte: aparte leggerai.
 Questa operetta: e notti ciascun uerso.
 Come e distincto tutto luniverso
 Con ogni suo elemento intenderai
 Stelle: comette: ecclipse trouerai
 Come e disposto in nui stato diuerso
 A qual benigno e il sole: a qual aduerso
 Come uolgie fortuna li suoi rai.
 Vedrai de tempi aduersi ogni figura.
 Di pietre preciose sue uirtute
 E de molti animal la lor natura
 Vitii: e exempli: questione: e dispute
 Che poi guidar tua barcha ala sicura
 E al fin trouarli porto di salute.

³ Cf. also the lines found at the end of the Laurentian Cod. Ashburnh. 1223, mentioned above. Following the text of the *Acerba* we read the postscript: *Explicit liber acerbe vite conditus per magistrum cechum de terra asculitana: Amen*: Then, after a hymn:

Essendo mi da li priori davanti
 En su quel gran pallaço di fiorença
 Fu publicato in contra me sentencia
 Per lo consiglio di lor tucti quanti
 Che arso fosse per dicto di *Dante*
 Senza risposta et veruna audentia
 Et fui disperso a torto per la inuidia
 Indigna era mia carne de omicidia
 Laus Deo. Amen.

In other words, the *Acerba* is an encyclopedia in little of human knowledge as it was conceived in Dante's and in Cecco's time, and invites comparison with such works as Brunetto Latini's *Tesoro* and Ristoro d'Arezzo's *Della Composizione del mondo*. The student of fourteenth century cosmography, astronomy, astrology, philosophy, and morality will find in the *Acerba* a rich field for research.⁴ Sig. Rosario with his new edition has broken the soil. Let us hope for an abundant harvest.

JOHN PIERREPONT RICE

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

A Study of the Writings of D. Mariano José de Larra, 1809-1837. By Elizabeth McGuire. In the University of California Publications in Modern Philology, vol. 7, pp. 87-130 (1918).

The author begins this study by saying that "Nothing has been written in English about Mariano José de Larra." If it was the author's intention to present a study for English speaking readers, would it not have been better to translate the rather numerous quotations from the Spanish and French? The original text could have been placed in the notes. The study is, in the main, a new presentation of the material found in the various studies on Larra. It would seem, however, that the author could have pointed out more adequately the vital influence on Larra's writing of the unfortunate love affair which led to his death; of his unhappy married life; and, toward the close of his career of his despair as to the possibility of a betterment in the political situation.

Under the caption "Larra's Significant Work" (p. 89), the author describes some of the difficulties of newspaper criticism in Larra's day, and points out that he attracted attention even in those troublous times, that he should be accorded indulgence on account of his extreme youth, that he embodied at least one phase of the spirit of romanticism, that he was versatile, that he married at twenty, and that his works are a greater monument to him than those of his contemporaries are to them. The author then takes up more in detail the question of Larra's attitude toward romanticism, which Larra is allowed to answer for himself (p. 93) by saying, in effect, that he is the follower of no one school. The next division of the study is headed "The Pseudonym Figaro." Noting the fact that pseudonyms were common at the time, the author drifts into a discussion of the value of Larra's irregularly appearing periodical, *El Pobrecito Hablador*. At length we arrive at the meeting in the *Café del Príncipe*, where Grimaldi suggests the name Figaro to Larra. The author concludes, correctly enough, that Larra chose the name because Beaumarchais' character exemplifies his own aspirations, viz., to become an excellent pessimistic satirist. To the

⁴ To furnish a single example, the bestiary and the lapidary contained in the *Acerba* not only afford interesting parallels to contemporary and medieval works of the same nature in Italy and elsewhere, they not only are rich in those poetic motives so much in vogue in early Italian art and literature, for which so great an artist as Leonardo consulted them; but the Introduction to the third part of Cecco's work opens with a full discussion of the scholastic love-philosophy of Guido Cavalcanti, Dante, and Cino da Pistoja, with quotations from the first two poets.

present writer it seems that Larra's prompt acceptance of the suggestion was due to the fact that in all probability he had seen the name in Étienne Jouy's *L'Hermite de la Chaussée d'Antin* (vol. iii, pp. 42 and 96), with which he was familiar.

In the chapter on "The Historical Value of Larra's Writings," the author, after referring to a certain article by Larra, proceeds (p. 106): "Now appeared his criticism of Dumas, including *Hernani* (*sic!*), Antony, Katherine Howard, and Margaret of Burgundy." It is in this part of the study (p. 107) that the author finds it appropriate to quote the last two paragraphs of Larra's justly famous *Día de difuntos de 1836*, which is called a "horrible nightmare." The "Unexpected Qualities" (p. 109) are discovered in the presence in Larra's writings of both "innata mordacidad" and sentiment. Something new in the "Sources of Larra's Dramas" is the disinclination to agree with Fitzmaurice-Kelly's statement that *No más mostrador* is taken from two French plays. The author finds little resemblance between the last three acts of Larra's play and Dieulafoy's *Le Portrait de Michel Cervantes* (p. 120). In the "Acknowledgment of his Debt to France" (pp. 124 ff.) are found the customary statements as to Larra's debt to the French. Antonio Cánovas del Castillo is made to stand sponsor for the year 1666 as the date of Juan de Zabaleta's *Día de fiesta por la mañana y la tarde* (p. 124). This work appeared in two parts, the *Día de fiesta por la mañana* in 1654, and the *Día de fiesta por la tarde* in 1659 (cf. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Hist. de lit. esp.*, Madrid, 1913, p. 363).

Some details may be noted. Misprints are numerous, especially in the French. On page 96 the note is missing. Failure to give the dates of publication of *No más mostrador* (1831) and *Roberto Dillon* (1832) makes it difficult to follow the discussion intelligently (p. 94). The author cites Cánovas del Castillo's assertion that certain of Larra's articles are taken from Jouy, without noting that the statement is challenged by M. Chaves (in his *D. Mariano José de Larra (Figaro): su tiempo*, etc., Sevilla, 1898, p. 40), and that Georges Le Gentil (*Bretón de los Herreros et la Société espagnole de 1830 à 1860*, Paris, 1909, p. 243), credits some of these articles to Jouy but omits others.—Larra translates (does not "quote") nearly all (but not all) the French on page 97 (cf. *Periódico nuevo*, near the end of the article).—The author states (p. 112) that Larra wrote, while at Paris in 1835, "a book in French descriptive of Spain." M. Chaves (*op. cit.*, p. 87) says that Larra helped write the book, working one month, and receiving 3,000 francs for his collaboration. Strange to say, Chaves gives the date of this book (*Voyage pittoresque en Espagne, en Portugal et sur la côte de l'Afrique*, etc., par J. Taylor) as MDCCCXXXII. Larra was in Paris in 1835.—The statement in the bibliography (p. 128), that four volumes of articles were published under the pseudonym Figaro is not quite exact. While it is true that Larra used the pseudonym Figaro most frequently, he also, after the *El Duende* had been forced to cease publication, employed other pseudonyms when signing his articles; for example, "Andrés Niporesas, Ramón Arriala," and "Juan Pérez de Munguía."—To give M. A. S. Hume's *Modern Spain* (New York edition, 1909) as a secondary authority on Larra (cf. p. 129) is a questionable procedure. Hume's only reference to Larra is on page 297, with a note. The note is as follows: "These sketches (on society, etc.) were usually published under a pseudonym. The most important were by

Calderon ("El Solitario"), Larra ("El Pobrecito Hablador"), and Mesonero Romanos ("El Curioso Parlante")—all being published in a kind of periodical called *Cartas Españolas*." Larra's paper was called *El Pobrecito Hablador*, and, as far as the present writer is aware, Larra never published anything in *Cartas Españolas* (1831-32).

W. S. HENDRIX

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

El Hispanismo en Norte-América, por M. Romera Navarro de la Universidad de Pensilvania. Renacimiento, San Marcos, 42; Madrid, —, pp. xii, 451.

In England for generations past the study of the Spanish language and literature has been especially favored. The names of Ormsby, Chorley, Fitzmaurice-Kelly and others are familiar even to the novice. But the work of their American confrères—with the exception of that of one or two scholars—is not so well known. Beginning with the gifted Ticknor and the early lexicographer Velásquez—whose name unfortunately does not figure in the present volume, but whose dictionary was of incalculable aid to the student of Spanish from the sixties to the nineties—Spanish scholarship in America has shown a varied, if not steady, development. With the publication of the grammars of W. I. Knapp (1882) and A. Hjalmar Edgren (1891) the study of Spanish received a new impetus here. Later on came M. M. Ramsey's *Text-Book of Modern Spanish*, a veritable mine of information for the student of that period. It is unfortunate indeed that Mr. Navarro should have overlooked the names of these two pioneer Hispanists. Professor Edgren was a poet and scholar of remarkable versatility, whose enthusiasm for Spanish literature was unbounded. Esteemed in Sweden as a poet of the first rank, and in France and Germany as a Sanskritist, his mind was nevertheless in many respects most practical. He realized the needs of the American student and sought to supply them as far as his intellect and strength would permit. As for Mr. Ramsey, be it said that whatever may be the shortcomings of his *Text-Book*, it was to a large extent the result of his own original researches, and has well served as a foundation for the study of syntax, and an almost inexhaustible source of information for most grammars that have since been written. The interest in things Spanish promoted by the publication of Ramsey's work, appearing as it did at an important psychological moment, was almost incredible, and progress in scholarship in this field was marked. In fact this efflorescence of studies devoted to Spanish literature and philology has been most gratifying to all Romance scholars in America.

Mr. Navarro is a brilliant young *littérateur* who is, as yet, new to our country. His Castilian point of view is therefore very refreshing, even if we do not find ourselves always in accord with his opinions and methods of classification. For example, the categories in which he places some of our foremost scholars do not entirely meet with our approval. From our vantage-ground his chapters on *Eruditos y poetas*, *Expositores y críticos*, and *Colectores y comentaristas* are probably most open to question. But in passing judgment we should not fail to remember that we are dealing with a work intended for Spanish readers, who are usually unaware of the fact that our interest in their culture and literature is most keen. A study of such a nature can therefore be written best by an

author of the type of Mr. Navarro, who brings to his task all the enthusiasm of an unprejudiced man of letters. His observations regarding Longfellow's *Spanish Student*—so long a mooted question—are not without value, and his appreciation of the work of Walsh, whose translations have been of yeoman-service in arousing public interest, is merited. Again in discussing the *Drama nuevo* of Tamayo y Baus, Mr. Navarro notes an interesting fact which seems to have escaped the attention of Messrs. Fitz-Gerald and Guild, authors of the latest translation of this work, viz., that the earlier translation entitled *Yorick's Love* was made by William Dean Howells.

Finally, in regard to editions of school-texts the author should have exercised his critical judgment more rigorously, for many of them have been not only ill-chosen but indifferently prepared. Why not separate the wheat from the chaff and limit the discussion to a few representative works? More prominence ought therefore to have been given to Professor Olmsted's excellent edition of Becquer. Professor Bassett's scholarly edition of Pereda's *Pedro Sanchez*, to which the author of these lines early drew attention (*Modern Language Notes*, 1909, pp. 222-224), is omitted altogether.

But the few shortcomings noted may be readily excused in view of the large amount of useful information contained in this volume. We can only be grateful to Mr. Navarro for having performed so well a difficult task.

JOHN L. GERIG

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

OBITUARY

EDOUARD JOSEPH FORTIER

Edouard Joseph Fortier, assistant professeur de langues et littératures romanes à l'Université Columbia, est mort à New-York le 24 décembre 1918. Fils de M. Alcée Fortier, professeur de langues et littératures romanes à l'Université Tulane de la Nouvelle Orléans, et de Mme Fortier née Lanauze, il appartenait à une vieille famille louisianaise dont l'origine est intéressante. Il y a deux siècles, François Fortier de St. Malo venait se fixer à la Nouvelle-Orléans avec sa femme Gabrielle Moreau d'Orange. Ce Breton et cette Provençale, issus de races amoureuses d'aventures, unissant à la solidité celtique la gaieté méridionale, firent souche d'hommes que la dure et précaire existence des colons ne rebuta pas. Leurs descendants partagèrent la fortune de la cité nouvelle, et comme si leur génie familial eût prévu les destinées de leur patrie, l'un d'entre eux, Michel Fortier, combattit pour l'indépendance des Etats-Unis d'Amérique quand les volontaires louisianais prirent part à la guerre contre l'Angleterre en 1779 et s'emparèrent de Mobile, Pensacola et Bâton-Rouge. Michel Fortier était alors sujet de Charles III roi d'Espagne, et c'est par un étrange détour du destin qu'il se dévoua ainsi à une cause qui n'était pas la sienne, mais allait devenir celle de ses petits-enfants. Avant la guerre de Sécession les Fortier furent planteurs, armateurs, hommes d'affaires; les événements de 1861-6 les ruinèrent et les générations suivantes se tournèrent avec succès vers les professions libérales. M. Alcée Fortier (cité plus haut), mort il y a quelques années, a laissé dans le monde universitaire, comme homme, éducateur et historien, une mémoire triplement honorée. La carrière de son fils, n'eût-elle été prématurément interrompue, promettait d'être aussi remplie, aussi utile.

Edouard Joseph Fortier, né à la Nouvelle Orléans le 9 décembre 1883, fit ses études dans sa ville natale, à l'école préparatoire Ferrell; en 1899 il entra à l'Université Tulane et en sortit en 1904 avec le diplôme de bachelier (B.A.). De 1904 à 1906 il suivit des cours de licence à l'Université Johns-Hopkins sous la direction de M. A. Marshall Elliott, l'un des romanistes les plus distingués de l'époque aux Etats-Unis. Simultanément, en 1905-6, il enseigna le français à Notre-Dame de Maryland. Le 11 Septembre 1906 il épousa Mademoiselle Marie Tricou de la Nouvelle-Orléans; de ce mariage est née une fille, Alida-Marie, le 3 Mars 1912.

Instructeur de langues romanes à l'Université de Yale en 1906-07, Edouard Fortier fut nommé ensuite à Urbana, à l'Université de l'Illinois, où il occupa le poste d'associé de 1907 à 1909. Durant 1908-1909 il se livra à des recherches sur l'histoire coloniale des Etats-Unis et publia dans les "Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Association" une monographie intitulée "The Founding of the Tamavois Mission." En 1910 il fut appelé comme instructeur de langues et littératures romanes à l'Université Columbia de New-York. En

1910-1911 il suivit les cours de doctorat de M. Adolphe Cohn, professeur de littérature française, et de M. H.-A. Todd, professeur de philologie romane. Pendant la session d'été de 1911 il enseigna à l'Université Tulane. En 1912 il présenta au premier "Congrès des lettres françaises," à Québec (Canada), une longue monographie, "Les Lettres françaises en Louisiane" (Québec, 1915). En 1916 il fut promu assistant professeur. Pendant la guerre il organisa à Columbia, durant la session d'été, le premier cours d'officiers interprètes de l'Armée américaine qui eût été créé aux Etats-Unis. Il traduisit de nombreuses brochures pour l'Y. M. C. A., la fondation Carnegie, etc. Chargé de 1914 à 1917 de reviser et mettre à jour les articles sur la littérature française et les biographies d'auteurs français dans la "New International Encyclopedia," il écrivit de nombreux articles originaux tels que: "Littérature française," "Molière," "Littérature provençale," "les Troubadours," "Voltaire," etc.

Edouard Fortier était membre des sociétés suivantes: Association des langues modernes de la Nouvelle-Angleterre, Historique de la Louisiane. Il était secrétaire de la Section des langues modernes de l'Université Columbia, etc.

Ce qui frappait avant tout chez Edouard Fortier, c'était son inlassable activité. Son apparence frêle cachait une énergie vibrante. Son esprit systématique, sa brièveté lucide, essentiellement dons d'administrateur, attirèrent bientôt l'attention de ses chefs; mais il fut en quelque sorte desservi par ces qualités mêmes, car mille petits devoirs dont il se chargeait volontiers et s'acquittait avec ponctualité l'empêchèrent de consacrer plus de temps à l'achèvement d'une thèse de doctorat sur les "Lettres françaises en Louisiane" qui eût été, par ce qu'on en connaît, du plus haut intérêt pour l'histoire de la littérature américaine. Comme professeur, Fortier possédait un large fond de connaissances et la rare faculté de transmettre ce qu'il savait à ses élèves. Il était pour les étudiants, un guide précieux; par sa franchise et sa fermeté, tempérées d'obligeance et de courtoisie, il gagnait rapidement leur confiance et la conservait toujours. Mais c'est surtout comme collègue qu'il valait d'être connu; un peu distant au premier abord, il devenait, la glace brisée, le plus franc, le plus sûr, le plus serviable des amis. Ses rares qualités lui promettaient un brillant avenir et sa mort est une perte non seulement pour ceux qui l'ont intimement connu mais pour la collectivité universitaire tout entière, car c'était un homme dans la plus belle acception du mot.

P. B.

LOUIS SELBERT

The death of Louis Selbert on November 26, at Columbia, Mo., from influenza, has made another sad inroad on our force of instructors in French. Born in Cincinnati in 1888, and graduating at the University of Cincinnati in 1909, Selbert first went abroad on a scholarship of the Alliance Française, and at once acquired a great and lasting admiration for France and the French people. In 1911 he entered Yale University as a graduate student, was called to the University of Missouri the following year as Instructor, returned to New Haven in 1914 to teach in the Sheffield Scientific School and continue his graduate work, and received in 1916 the degree of Ph.D. from Yale. A few months before he had been summoned back to Missouri to an Assistant Professorship of Romance Languages, a position he was holding at the time of his

death. Devoted to his work with his students, his reserved and silent nature hid much of his thought and feeling from his associates, and few suspected that intense devotion to France revealed by the request of his last hours for the *Marseillaise* and a selection from Saint-Saëns. At the funeral services in Cincinnati the *Marseillaise* was again played, and the tricolor of France draped his coffin.

F. M. W.

JOHN MARVIN BURTON

On September 22, 1918, John Marvin Burton, Professor of Romance Languages at Millsaps College, and a soldier in the American Expeditionary Force, died of broncho-pneumonia. Of sturdy Virginia stock, Burton was graduated from Randolph-Macon College, taught in Millsaps College, returning there as professor in 1916 after three years' absence for graduate study, at the conclusion of which he had received his doctorate from the Johns Hopkins University. He was a man of strong character, studious habits, and sound intellectual endowments, respected by all who knew him and with a promising future in his profession. He was spending his life for the good of America and of France; he spent it to the full in the military service of his own country and on the soil of France. Faithful in death to the aims for which he had lived, his career though brief, was not incomplete.

E. C. A.

ELIZABETH STEARNS TYLER (1888-1919)

Elizabeth Stearns Tyler was born at Amherst, Mass., Jan. 17, 1888. She prepared for college at Dana Hall, Wellesley, and studied at Smith College from 1905 to 1909, receiving the degree of A.B. in the latter year. She pursued further studies at Paris, and, for a while, in Italy, in 1909-1910. She taught French in the Amherst High School from 1910 to 1912, at Abbot Academy in 1912-1913, and at Nyack, New York, in 1915-1916. After doing graduate work at Smith College in 1913-1914, she followed with distinction advanced courses in the Summer Session of Columbia University in 1915. The degree of A.M. was awarded her at Smith College in 1917. She continued her graduate studies at Columbia in 1916-1918, and received the degree of Ph.D. at that institution in June, 1918. Her examination for this degree will be remembered as one of the most brilliant of recent years.

Soon after Commencement in the summer of 1918, Miss Tyler sailed for France in the service of the Red Cross. She was assigned to the care of refugees, and threw herself into her work with enthusiasm. Her excellent knowledge of spoken French and her admiration for the French people made her services invaluable. She was taken ill suddenly while on duty at Sedan, and died on February 22, 1919.

Romance scholarship suffered a real loss in the untimely passing away of Elizabeth Tyler, as is indicated by her recent articles in this *Review* and by her edition of the *Chanson de Willame*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1919. She had outlined numerous other studies in the field of the early literature of France. Her work showed an increasing power, and it may be said of her life that every year was better than its predecessor and that the final year was the

best of all. Her supreme sacrifice in the great cause was worthy of her. Her many friends and her former teachers will always remember her bright enthusiasm, her remarkable originality and her generous and noble heart.

Æquius fuerat te hoc mihi fecisse.

R. W.



NOTES AND NEWS

Mr. Louis Cons, who, thruout the war, served with high distinction in the French army, has been appointed Assistant Professor of French at Princeton.

Mr. Arthur Langfors has publisht *Les Incipit des Poèmes Français antérieurs au XVI^e Siècle. Répertoire bibliographique établi à l'aide de Notes de M. Paul Meyer*, I, Paris, Champion, 1918. This work is extremely valuable, as is the *Bibliographie Sommaire des Chansonniers Français du Moyen Age* (manuscripts et éditions), par A. Jeanroy, Paris, Champion, 1918 (in the *Classiques Français du Moyen Age*).

La Littérature de Guerre, Manuel méthodique et critique des Publications de Langue Française (Août 1914–Août 1916), par Jean Vic, 2 vols., Paris, Payot, 1918, is one of the most scholarly and useful books which have appeared concerning the war. The preface is by Gustave Lanson. Mr. Jean Vic stands ready to do literary research in French and Spanish in French libraries. He can be adrest at the Bibliothèque Nat., Paris.

Tales of the Sorbonne, Methuen, London, 1918, is the title of an interesting book meant as a tribute to the Paris of Gaston Paris and Paul Meyer. The volume is signed Rachel Fox, which we are inclined to consider a nom de plume.

Mr. William H. Allen, formerly with the Oxford University Press, has establisht himself as a dealer in valuable second hand books, at Temple, Pa., R. F. D. 1.

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

VOL. X—JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1919—No. 3

LA VIE DE SAINTE EUPHROSINE

(Continued from Vol. X, page 169)

DE SAINTE EUFROYSINE

Fol. 87r.

- I. Nove chançon vos dimes de bele antiquité,
Ystore bone et dulce, plaine de verité;
Faite est d'une pucele de grant nobilité.
D'Alisandre fut nee, une riche cité.
A Deu Nostre Sagnor voat virginité; 5
Por lui gerpit son pere et tote heredité;
La vie de cest siecle tint tot a vanité;
Deu servit par amor en grant humilité;
De mut halte richece vint a grant povreté;
Mones devint la dame par conseil d'un abé. 10
- II. Nove chançon vos dimes del tens ancienor;
Faite est d'une pucele, anc n'oï gentior.
De la terre d'Egypte fut nee iceste flor;
Druerie prist tal o Deu Nostre Sagnor
Ke por chierté de lui gerpit tot altre amor; 15
N'ot cure de doare ne de prendre sagnor
Que li offrit ses peres o mervilhose honor,
Jovencel de parage, fil d'un riche contor;
Mais ele ne presist le fil l'empereor.
N'at cure de la joie ki revert a tristor. 20
- III. Pasnutius ses peres fut de riche parage,
Heredité ot bone qui mut de son linage;
De l'esp[1]oit kin essit ne sai faire estimage.
Molhier prist honeree ki fut de son terrage;
Demenerent lor tens a mut riche barnage, 25
Mais n'ont filhe ne fil ki ait lor heritage.

- Li sire en at teil dol k'il i tuert a la rage.
 La molhier l'en chastie; ele en est [mut] plus sage.
 Et il en at ver li plus obscur le corage;
 Fol. 87v. Andoi plaignent ensemble lor cumunal damage. 30
- IV. Panutius fut sages, se li vint a viaire
 Que ne doit a sa feme dire afeit ne contraire,
 Anz doit querre merci ver Deu de cel afaire.
 Az orisons s'en torne et az almosnes faire;
 C'est la riens que il seit ki plus suet a Deu plaire. 35
 A un abeit s'en prent; de ses peirs ne sai gaire;
 Katre vins ans vescu tozjors vestus de haire.
 En la terre d'Egypte ne fut miedre ne maire
 Por doner bon conseil et por bel sermon traire.
 Panutius i vait por mostrer son afaire. 40
- V. Panutius i vait coreçous et pensis;
 De l'or et de l'argent at bien sor l'atel mis,
 Puis dist al sogrestain ce que li fut avis:
 "A l'abé vuelh parler; ne me soies escis,
 Car el mien parlement arat il prou totdis. 45
 S'il me puet avoier de ce k'ai ici quis,
 Tozjors li mosterai cum je li sui amis.
 Fai moi a lui parler, si en es posteïs.
 De son prou et del mien soies mes bons plaidis.
 Redevant te serai tant ke je serai vis." 50
- VI. Li sogrestains le vait a dant abé nuncier,
 Qui seoit en l'encloistre en sa main un psaltier.
 Conte li que Pasnuces est venuz al mostier;
 Bel present lor a fait d'argen blanc et d'or mier.
 "Parler vuet a toi, sire, car de toi at mestier." 55
 L'abes ist de l'enclostre a[1] baron consilhier.
 Li bers li dist son estre et cel a sa molhier
 Et sa dure aventure et tot son deseier:
 Fol. 88r. Son tens pert et sa joie cant n'at oir de molhier,
 Cui il deuïst son fief et sa terre laisser. 60
- VII. L'abes et li covens promisent al baron
 Que por la sue amor en feront orison.
 Panuces s'en revait toz lies a sa maison;
 A l'abeit en priveit dist sa peticion.
 L'abes en priat Deu par grant devotion: 65

Deus ki a[l] siste jor de ta creation
De l'home et de la feme feïs ajostison,
Creistre les comandas et replenir le mon ;
Membre toi de Panuce par te saintisme non.
Otroie li, chier sire, ce que nos te proion. 70

VIII. Deus, sire(s) omnipotens, qui n'as commencement,
Qui totes creatures establis de nient,
Un home et une feme plasmas premierement ;
Des dous as tu formé en terre tante gent.
Tu seis que vuet Panuses et a coi il entent ; 75
Oir vuet avoir en terre ki ait son casement.
De sa franche molhier le te kier humlement.
Otroie li, chier sire, s'i[l]toi vient a talent,
Se tu se prout i vois et son amendement.
Escute la priere de cest nostre covent." 80

IX. Deus amat mut l'abeit et la sainte abeïe.
L'orison a l'abeit at mut bien obeïe
Et l'amone Pasnuse at en greit recolhie.
Une filhe lor done ; anz tal ne fut oïe
De sens et de biaté puis la virgene Marie. 85
Li peres et la mere l'ont suavet nurrie.
Set ans l'ont dulcement et gardeë et bagnie ;
Fol. 88v. Adont l'ont presentee a la sainte abeïe.
Theodosius l'at haltement baptizie ;
Solonc crestienteit ot nom Eüfrosie. 90

X. E vos Eüfrosine baptizie et levee
Et a l'aute[l] demaine ot s'offrande portee.
L'a(u)bes ki Deu la quist l'at a Deu presentee ;
Proie li ke la gart a sa part honeree,
Que ja por sa biaté ne li creisse ponee 95
Ne par ome morteil ne soit ja violee.
Puis l'at li bons abeis a son pere livree
Et li peres l'en at a sa cité menee.
A escole la met, si l'at bien doctrinee.
Ans k'ele auïst doze ans, fut bien des ars paree. 100

XI. Cant doze ans ot complis la virgene gloriose,
Avint li une chose qui mut fut delerose :
Ele perdit sa mere et Panuses s'espose.
Li pere en fait por li almone ponderose
A[l]clergier de la vilhe, a la gent besignose ; 105

Ne n'at glise en la vilhe n'e[n]soit lie et joiose.
 Sepulture li funt de metal mervilhose ;
 Le cors ont enbasmét de myrre presiose.
 La nobile pucele soi gaimente et dolose ;
 De la mort de sa mere soi claime dolerose. 110

XII. Doze ans at acomplis la bele Eüfrosine ;
 Deus ! ke dure aventure avint a la mechine !
 Ele perdit sa mere, si remest orphenine.
 La nobile pucele soi clamo[i]t miserine ;
 O ses dogies mains deront sa b[l]oie crine. 115

Fol. 89r. Deruie sa masele et sa blanche poitrine.
 Sepulture li font d'une pierre marbrine ;
 Le cors ont envolut de purpre alixandrine.
 Almone font mirable a la gent poverine. 120

XIII. La cité d'Alixandre eret riche et antive,
 Replenie d'avoir et de pople fortive,
 Plaine d'envoseüre et de gent amelive.
 Le jor virent la virgene k'ert remeise soltive ;
 Por la mort de sa mere si soi clamoit chaitive. 125
 Tant bele creature ne fut morte ne vive,
 Cant la donzele plore et sa biatez avive.
 Le jor l'ont amiree la jovente hastive ;
 Quierent le a espose cele gent posteïve,
 Mais ele lor serat, ce cuit, asez escive. 130

XIV. Le jor fut amiree assez la jovencele
 Por sa bele color, por sa blanche masele.
 En la terre d'Egypte n'ert veüe tant bele.
 Nuz ne la conisoit ; a toz eret novele.
 Nurie avoit esteit en chanbre la donzele ; 135
 Dolcement l'at aprise li pere en sa chapele.
 Par la vilhe en corut a cel jor la novele.
 Li filh az riches omes font querre la pucele.
 La bele Eüfrosine, ja lor tort a favele,
 Alhors at son penser ; foz est qui l'en apele. 140

XV. Miree fut le jor Eüfrosine assez.
 Les barons de la vilhe at mis en granz pensez ;
 Parolent de Panuze et de ses recheez
 Et de sa bele filhe et de ses heritez.

	<i>La Vie de Sainte Euphrosine</i>	195
	A bieneuïros tinent ki en iert mariez.	145
Fol. 89v.	Assez en fut Panuzes sovent araisez, Des fiz az riches homes requis et apelez, Mais ne il les reçoit, n'il les at refusez, Anz respont a chascun : " N'irat mie a noz grez. Deus ki le m'at donee, face'n ses volentez."	150
XVI.	En la cité astoit uns cuens mut posteïs, Saisis de grant avoir et efforcies d'amis ; Heredité ot bone et manoir bien assis. Un filh ot senglement, n'ot si gent el país, Et il ert affloibis et venuz a ses dis. Se filh volt marier, tant ke il eret vis. Por celui at Panuze de sa filhe requis Et Panuzes astoit de ce ver lui bahis. Otroie li la dame, car ce li fut avis, Nel pot miez emploier a ome del país.	155 160
XVII.	E vos Eüfrosine promise al chevalier. Panuzes l'en saisit a un rain d'olivier ; Ce fut signefiance qu'i[l] les vuet amier ; Pais durable et concorde vuet entr'iaz aloier. Li donziaz l'enerrat d'une noze d'or mier ; Les pieres preciose[s] ne sauïst on prisier ; Un amatiste i ot mut precios et chier. Il li fermat a[l]col, puis si le vot baisier, Mais ele ne li vot a nul jor otrier ; Tot se bon de se cors vuet a Deu estoier.	165 170
XVIII.	Entretant vont li jor(s), passent li temporal. Mut demoret li termes des noces al vasal ; Mut li sunt lonc li jor et les nuiz atretal ; Tart li est que il soit al delit corporal.	
Fol. 90r.	La nobile pucele se porpensoit tot d'al ; Ele en apele Deu, le roi esperital : " Sire, fai moi merci ; si me garde de mal. Tu comandas, ce sai, mariage loial, Mais tu vassis mies naistre de ventre virginal, Car ja virgene et uxor ne seront d'un terral.	175 180
XIX.	Je sai ke loial chose at mut en mariage, Qui voroit netement demener sens putage, Ki ne s'en sorferoit ne n'i menroit utrage,	

- Cum font cil jovencel qui tot sunt plain de rage,
 Qui ne sevent lor cors atempler de folage ; 185
 Mais assez est plus gent garder le pucelage
 Et mener sens dangier chastement son eage
 Et degerpir por toi parens et yretage.
 Ei! sire, afferme moi ver toi itel corage,
 Que toi ne puisse perdre por croistre me linage. 190
- XX. Ei! sire, aïue moi par la toue dolzor,
 Por la vie del siecle ke ne perde t'amor.
 Contre toi n'ai ge chier ne amis ne honor.
 Petit pris l'iretage, se toi n'ai a sagnor.
 Otroie moi, chier sire, toi sol [a] ameor 195
 Et je t'otroi mon feu et me cors et m'amor,
 De ma virginité la joie et la baudor.
 Ja par ma volenté non esteraï uxor ;
 Mut en crien le dangier et l'ire parentor.
 A toi en quier conseil et aïue et valor." 200
- XXI. Li peres convoitos de la chose esp[loitier]
 Eslonges fait or alkes, ne seit riens gaagner,
 Ne l'espous nel vuet mais soffrir ne respitier.
 Fol. 90v. O l'abé Theodose s'en revait consilhier ;
 La bele Eüfrosine maine o soi al mostier ; 205
 Offrande i refait bele d'argen blanc et d'or mier ;
 O le saintisme abeit se prent a desrainier :
 "Chier sire, ci t'amain le tresor k'ai plus chier,
 Ma filhe Eüfrosine, dont degnas Deu proier,
 Et il le me dona de Brahan ma molhier. 210
- XXII. Je le t'amain ici que a sagnor la don,
 A gentil chevalier, fil de riche baron ;
 Apele Damledeu, fai por li orison,
 Que li doist et otroie sainte beneïçon."
 Et li abes respont ducement : " Le feron. 215
 Trois jors remanrez or en la sainte maison ;
 Mut i at de bons omes de grant religion ;
 Il en proieront Deu par grant devotion."
 A la france pucele atorne sa raison ;
 De tenir chaste[e]it li at fait bel sermon. 220
- XXIII. " Filhe tu es letree, si seis de l'escriture.
 Tu seis ke nostre sire est nete chose et pure.

Il aime nete[e]it en tote creature,
Meïmement en cele qu'i[l] fist a sa figure,
Si cum dist Moyses el livre de nature. 225
Chasteez est loee en tote letreüre
Et sor tote altre riens est vil chose luxure.
Filhe, aime chasteet ne siure envoieüre!
Mut at tes pere(s) en toi faite bele engenrure.
Garde [toi] ne li faces de toi honte n'enjure. 230

XXIV. Humles soies et chaste sens orguel et boban.
Fol. 91r. Menbre toi de Sara qui fut femme Abrahan,
De Rebecca la saive, de Racel l'avinan
Por cui soffrit Jacob, ses maris, tant ahan;
Set ans servi por li a son oncle Laban. 235
Esgarde de Susanne, k'en fisent li paban.
Menbre toi de Judith qui ocist le tyran,
De Vasti l'orgilhose qui niat Manmucan,
Qui perdit par orguel le lit a[l] roi persan;
Hester le conquist puis, ki fist ocire Aman." 240

XXV. Trois jors ont converseit en la sainte abeïe.
Mut plot a la pucele lor covens et lor vie.
Tote s'entensions est a la psalmodie
Que cantoit li covens et le nuit et le die
Et disoit en se cuer: "Ei! Deus! kal compagnie! 245
Se je ci pooie estre, que seroie garie!
Totens oroie mais la bele melodie,
Le can angelical et la dolce armonie;
Cist sunt angele en cest siecle et de vois et de vie.
Nos alons querant glore et cist l'ont ja saisie. 250

XXVI. Trois jors avoit Panuzes en l'abeïe esté;
Prendre volt le congié, si at l'abé apelé:
"Aler nos en volons, chier sire, a la cité;
Menbre toi de t'ancele et prie por li Dé!"
La pucele meïsmes li requiert karité, 255
Que ne mete en obli ce que li at loé,
Le sermon qu'i[l] li fist de tenir chasteé.
L'abes levat sa main, si le segnat de Dé;
Por li fait orison en grant humilité:
"Sire, qui en la virgene presis humanité, 260

- XXVII. Qui toz homes conois anz que il soient né,
 Fol. 91v. De faire bien u mal lor lais la poste[é],
 Mais de sol le bien faire dones la volenté;
 De ceste tue ancele cuil le service en gré.
 Tu le donas Panuse par ta grant pieté. 265
 Li dons qui de toi vient doit bien estre en chierté.
 Garde le de cest siecle et de sa vanité.
 Dols seroit, se li siecles engignoit tel biaté.
 O les saintes puceles li done en ton regné
 Par la tue mercit part et heredité." 270
- XXVIII. Panuzes et sa filhe sunt torné del chasal;
 A la cité en vont a lor demaine ostal.
 L'espous heit la demore et, ja li tort a mal,
 Eüfrosine at bien delaiét le vassal;
 Dis et uit ans avoit a icel temporal. 275
 Avint ke li bons abes faisoit feste annual
 Del ordination, cum al jor del Noial.
 Le covent conreoit de conroit festival;
 En la cité tremist un mone esperital
 Por convoier Panuze, son ami(s) capital. 280
- XXIX. En la maison Panuze est li mones venuz;
 Il ne l'i trovat mie, car fors astoit issuz.
 Ans qu'i[l] repaire mais, serat toz deceüz.
 Il le comande a querre; uns mes i est coruz.
 En la sale est li mones entretant remasuz. 285
 Vint a lui la pucele, si li fait ses saluz;
 Dist li: "Sire, tu es de Deu plains et ses druz
 Et por amor de lui coronez et tonduz.
 Un conseil te dirai, ne vuel quel sache nuz;
 Et de confession doit hom bien estre muz. 290
- Fol. 92r. XXX. En karité moi di cum avez grant covent!"
 "Par ma foi, damoisele, mone sumes troi cent
 Et quarante doi plus de mut saintisme gent."
 "Cantez vos tot ensemble et vivez igalment?"
 "Ensemble cantons nos en un cor voirement, 295
 Mais en nostre jeüne at il devisement.
 Qui bien puet jeüner, junet a son talent,
 Que n'en face moleste a soi ne al covent."
 "Qui a vostre mostier vait por amendement,
 Reçoi[t] le vostre pere?" "Oïl, joioisement! 300

- XXXI. Abes qui ce ne fait a estros il offent
La vois Nostre Sagnor et son comandement,
Qui dist : ' Ki vient a moi nel getrai de nient.'
Ki se vuet convertir et de bon cuer se rent,
Purement soit confes, vegnet seürement." 305
" De venir a ceste ordene avroie grant talent,
Mais je ai un mien pere aviros et manent
Qui me vuet marier o tot son casement."
" Garde toi, chiere filhe, d'ital engegnement !
L'amors de cest vain siecle vait par encantement. 310
- XXXII. L'amor[s] de cest vain siecle senpres vient senpres vait.
Cil ki plus en conquiert, c'est cil qui plus en lait,
Ne ja segurs n'en iert tant ke il riens en,ait.
Mut at mal ensiant qui aünee en fait,
De la riens ke il seit qui a le mort le trait. 315
L'amors de cest vain siecle come fumeë vait ;
Les oez crieve a la gent, tant come ele i estait.
Un plain guant n'en puet l'om estoïr a nul plait
Et tant come il en at, totens est en aguait.
- Fol. 92v. Ki bien l'aime et li sert gueredon en at lait. 320
- XXXIII. Or ne laisser te cors a home mergelhier
Ne la tue biaté livrer en reprochier.
Epose toi a Deu, sin aras gent lowier ;
Por petit de labor recivras le donier
Por cui sunt travilhîé tres Adam le premier ; 325
Et ce que poroit estre bien te sai consilhier :
Torne toi en emblant, si t'en vas al mostier,
Que tes peres Panuzes ne te face enconbrier.
Ton abit seculer toi covient a cangier.
Garde toi de l'espous qu'il ne t'aut calengier." 330
- XXXIV. " Sire," dist la pucele, " bien savez pre[e]chier.
Consel m'avez donét, gentior ne vos quier,
Mais ançois m'i estuet un pou aparilhier ;
Un mone qui me tonde et dras sace talhier.
Ces lais omes redot, car trop sunt novelier." 335
Li mones li respont : " Or ne t'en esmaier !
Tes peres vat o moi hui cest jor al mostier.
Dans abes l'at mandét, qu'i vorat festoier.
De trois jors u de quatre ne porat repairier.
Envoie a l'abeïe un tien familier ; 340

- Un mone fai venir qui te sache aïdier.
Entretant poras bien de la chose esplotier.”
- XXXV. La pucele respont: “Mut bien me consilhie.
Ver Deu, Nostre Sagnor, des orisons m'aidiez!”
Entretant est Panuzes en maison repairiez; 345
Voit le mone et sa filhe u seoit a ses piez;
Dist li: “Mais por coi, sire, es a nos travilhiez?
Que nos mande dans abes? Est il sains et haitiez?”
Fol. 93r. “Sains est il,” dist li mones; “Deus en soit grasiez!
Feste frat demain grant; vuet que vos i soiez. 350
Por vos conduire a lui sui ici envoiez.”
Et Panuzes respont: “J'en sui aparelhiez.”
- XXXVI. Par aigue en vait Panuzes a la sainte abeie,
El batel siet o lui li mones qui l'enguie.
La bele Eüfrosine at en maison gerpie, 355
Qui ne se contient mie come femme esbahie.
De can que li fut oes est le jor bien garnie
Et la nuit at trestote en orison finie.
Cant li jors apparut et l'abe est escarcie,
Apele un canbrelain, celui u miez se fie. 360
“Al mostier Teodoise m'en cuer, a l'abeie.
Un moine m'en amaine; nel diras en ta vie.”
- XXXVII. Li canbrelains fait ce que li fut comandé(e).
El port desoz le phar at un moine trové;
Vendoit ce qu'il avoit al marchié aporté. 365
Issi ert la constume a[z]mones del regné
Vivre de lor labor a grant necessité;
A[l] tier jor u al quart, cant avoient ovré,
Portoient lor ovretes a vendre a la cité;
Del pris avoient pain et dras a povreté. 370
Se riens en remanoit, aloit en carité.
Ja nuz mones d'Egypte n'auist proprieté.
- XXXVIII. Li canbrelains trovat le bon mone el marché;
Le message a la dame li at dit et conté:
“Ma dame Eüfrosine vos at a soi mandé.” 375
Et li mones respont: “G'irai de volenté.”
Li canbrelains l'en at a la virgene amené.
Fol. 93v. Oi, Deus! A ke bone ore sunt le jor ajosté!
Anc n'i ot un sol mot parlé de vanité.
La premiere parole fut ‘*benedicite*’! 380

Et il le beneïst, si le segnat de Dé.
Ele enclinat parfont par grant humilité.

XXXIX. Kant il furent assis, ele mut la raison :
"Sire, ci t'ai mandé; oies en l'oquison.
Un pere ai ki mut at riche possession; 385
Et or et bones pieres et argent a bandon.
Uxor prist dont il m'ot par la petition
A l'abé Theodose qui kist a Deu le don.
Or me vuet marier al fil a un baron
Cui doist se chasement et sa riche maison, 390
Mais je n'aroie cure de ceste ajostison.
Di moi par karité de Deu alcun sermon."

XL. Li mones li respont: "Que vues que toi dion?
De ce dont as tochié un pou te respondron.
Deus dist en l'Evangile que tenons et lison: 395
'Qui ne gerpist por moi pere et mere et maison
Et freres et serors et tote affection
Et enfans et amis et sa possession
Et tote volenté ki tort a mesfaçon,
Il n'iert li miens desciples ne n'arat portion 400
Ne droit ne iretage *in regno celoron.*'
Plus ne sai que te die de ceste question.

XLI. Nonporhuec se tu as te cuer si esprové,
Que te puisses tenir de tote legierté,
Laisse(s) tot, si t'en fui por amor de sol Dé. 405
Assez arat tes peres cui doinst s'eredité;
Fol. 94r. Almonier sunt assez et mostier a planté
Et rencluz et hermite qui ont grant povreté.
Departes son avoir tot a sa volenté;
Et tu, pense(s) de t'arme, cum la rendes a Dé; 410
Et te cors garde net et ta virginité.
Deus est virgenes et purs, si aime neteeé."

XLII. Kant oît la pucele la parole altiment,
Apris at a bries moz kan qu'ele aloit querent;
Anc n'oît mais sermon, si li fust a talent. 415
De la vertu de Deu a[t] pris tel hardement
Par le Saint Esperit ki le cors li ensprent.
Tot li fait oblîer can k'a cest siecle apent;
Ne li membre de pere, n'at cure de parent.
Toz les deliz del siecle atornet a nient. 420

Affiche soi a Deu et dist segurement :
 " En Damledeu m'affi, le roi omnipotent,
 Et [en] tes orisons, a cui je mut m'atent.

XLIII. A travilhier m'avient por m'arme voirement
 O laïue de Deu par te maintenant." 425

" Et Deus le te doist faire, chiere suer, fermement,
 Car icist deseier sunt bon a escient.
 Saisi ta penitence, n'i ait delaïement ;
 Li tens vat et li jor sunt isnel et corent.
 L'om ne seit a quele ore vient la mors qui l'atent. 430
 Voilier doit qui se crient del laron sorduiant.
 A la raïx de l'arbre sunt li destral trecent,
 Qui de l'arme et del cors funt le deseivrement."

XLIV. La bele Eüfrosine ne se puet mais soffrir,
 Si est entalentee de Damedeu servir. 435

Fol. 94v. D'amor et de dolçor la veisiés fremir.
 Les dras ot aprestez, les forces fait venir ;
 A guise de nonain se fait tondre et vestir.
 L'ordene saint Benoeit at voét a tenir.
 Espose Deu vuet estre et le siecle gerpir. 440
 Li mones qui le tont et le doit beneïr,
 De joie et de pitié li at fait un sospir ;
 Flore tant piement, ne s'en puet aténir.

XLV. Cant li mones saisit a oes Deu la pucele,
 Se nom li at cangié ; Esmerade l'apele. 445

Cis nons est comunaz a marle et a femele.
 Esmerades est gemme et preciose et bele.
 Ele est jostee a Deu come pierre en anele,
 Car ele est et s'espouse et s'amie et s'ancele.
 Sa colors, sa verdors li est frece et novele. 450
 U ke vait li espos, o li vait sa donzele.
 Une est des doses pieres en la Deu coronele.
 El temple Salomon n'en ot nule plus bele.

XLVI. Des or est Esmerade espousee et saisie
 A Deu, Nostre Sagnor, le fil sainte Marie. 455

Ele li vorat estre et privee et amie.
 Li mones ki l'avoit et tondue et vestie
 Prie Deu ki le gart a la sue partie,
 Que ja riens ne departe mais la lor druërie,
 Ne li puisse nuissir li Sathan par envie. 460

A Deu l'at comandee, qui tot at en baillie.
Loe li que s'en alt par tens a l'abeie,
Que nel sache ses peres, ne ne la contredie.

- XLVII. Eüfrosine est none. Ses peres nel seit mie,
Fol. 95r. Ne l'espos ki plus l'aime que tot l'or de Surie; 465
Et li mones s'en vat, ki a Deu l'at saisie.
Remese est en penser cum celerat sa vie;
Si s'en vat az nonains, si soit en l'almonie,
Quise i ert et trovee et par force ravie
Et rendue a l'espos; issi seroit honie. 470
Nes d'eissir de la terre n'est ele pas garnie.
Sole ne seit aleir, qu'ele ne soit laidie,
Ne a home mortel ne prendroit compaignie.
- XLVIII. Se se conseil disoit, cuidroit estre traie.
Menbre li ke David dist en la prophetie: 475
"Gette en Deu te penser et en lui sol t'afie
Et il te garderat d'error et de folie."
A la terre s'estent por kerre a Deu aie.
"Deus, ki saint Raphaël envoias a Tobie
Qui cieus ert et chaitis soz le roi d'Assirie; 480
A lui rendis les oes, se filh salvas la vie.
Angles de halt conseil conseilhe moi et guie,
Por cui amor je ai tote riens degerpie."
- XLIX. Ancor n'avoit la dame s'orison parfinie,
Cant li vint li conses de par sainte Sophie. 485
L'ordene qu'ele at voét tenrat tote sa vie,
Mais semblant de nonain ele ne porrat mie;
Ans gerpirat trestot l'abit de feminie
Et s'en irat az mones de la sainte abeie
Et vestirat dras d'ome, qu'ele n'i soit coisie. 490
Sa volenté afferme, puis si l'at aconplie.
Gette dras de nonain et prent chevalerie.
Or oiés damosele painturee et forbie.
- Fol. 95v. L. Osteit at la nonain la bele Eüfrosine:
Chemise de cansil vestit por l'astamine; 495
En liu de la cucule le peliçon d'ermine;
Por le froc un mantel de purpre utremarine;
Por le voilh une coiffe a ovre alixandrine;
L'amite a or batue a color saphirine;
Chaces d'un pale vert at chacié la mescine. 500

O taz dras vuet aler a la cort la regine.
 Nel faisoit por orguel, mais por bele doctrine.
 Miezs en est al mostier, a la gent poverine.

- L.I. Des or est bien la none vestie et conree[e].
 Bien senblaist chevalier, se çainte euïst espee. 505
 Ja par home n'iert mais a nonain encontree;
 Et at pris cin cens solz de monoie provee;
 Puis s'i est tote nuit en un liu acutee.
 Par matin, ans ke pot, est a la glise alee.
 A l'abeïe en vait, u ele astoit privee. 510
 A[1] portier a parlé come feme apensee;
 Et voiz et continence a si bien devisee,
 Ja par ome qui vive n'iert jor mais avisee.

- L.II. "Portier, fai moi parler vias a dant abé!
 Dis li que a la porte as laissiét un castré. 515
 Sers sui l'empereor, si aport karité;
 Et vulh parler o lui d'un conseil [mut] privé."
 Li portiers bat l'anel, si at l'abé apelé.
 L'abes ot le tenten, si n'at pas demoré.
 Cil li dist la parole, si l'at fors amené. 520
 Esmerades le vit, s'at le cap encliné;
 Et li baise la boce par grant humilité.

Fol. 96r. Sa volenté li dist et soi li at celé.

- L.III. "Canbrelains del palais Teodoise ai esté
 Et servi en la cuer que li altre castré. 525
 En la terre d'Egypte ai riche eredité.
 N'i at oir ne mais moi de tot me parenté.
 Alcant ome ont a moi de monie parlé.
 Icest vostre covent si m'ont sovent loé,
 Que bien tinent lor ordene et aiment chasteé. 530
 De converser o vos aroie volenté.
 Sire, car me reçoï par sainte karité.
 Oste me de pechié; fai me servir a Dé."

- L.IV. L'abes fut dolce riens et de religion.
 Oït cum saintement fist sa petision 535
 Et de la sainte chose vit la conponction.
 Les larmes li coroient des olz a grant fuison.
 Respondi dolcement: "Frere, voi la maison!
 Ensaie lons la regle la conversasion.
 Se t'i plaist remanoir, volentiers te codron. 540

Esmerades respont: "Et nos l'esaëron."
Dont trait les cinc cenx solz k'avoit en se mofon
Et dist: "Recivez ore ce que nos aporton.

- LV. Se Deus ce nos consent ke o vos remanon,
Tote nostre herité, se Deu plaist, i lairon." 545
"Livre te donc a Deu et nos te reciv[r]on.
Un mastre qui t'apprende de l'ordene te querron
Et les dras ki avinent a riegle toi donron.
Con te nomerons nos?" "Esmerades ai non."
L'abes li at livrez dras de religion 550
Et li balhe custode un mone Agapiton
Fol. 96v. Ki bien astoit letrez et si esprovez hon
Qu'i[l] ne cremoit diable et sa temptasion.
- LVI. L'abes l'at coroné et vestut de l'abit;
Agapitun se maistre apele, si at dit: 555
"Garde moi bien cestui; prodom serat, s'il vit.
Doctrine le moi bien et en fait et en dit.
Miedres soit que ses maistres; si sera il, ce quit."
Ce que l'abes comande li bons maistre obeît;
Anz en [to]te sa vie a nul jor nel gerpit. 560
Trente et uit ans l'amat toz plains [et] sil(z) servit;
Ans ne la vit iree ne sa fable n'oît,
Ne ne sot que fust femme ne nul semblant n'en vit.
- LVII. Kant fut Eüfrosine vestie et conree[e].
Agapytus ses maistres l'at des ordenes parée. 565
Az orisons l'en at en la glise menée.
Parut sa blance cars, sa face encoleree,
Li olh vair et riant et la boche molee.
La congregations por pou ne fut dervée.
Cogitasion male lor est el cuer montee. 570
Li jovencel l'esgardent cum beste saëtee
Et dient en lor cuer: "U fut ceste trovee?"
Li saive ome ont la cose a dant abé mostree.
- LVIII. Dient li: "Fai oster cest castré d'entre nous.
Ce n'est mie castrez, mais Sathan l'envïous 575
Qui nos vuet trebuchier en ses laz a estrous.
S'entre ces jovenciaz estat un jor u dous,
Ja en orons tal chose dont tot serons gragnous."
L'abes ot la parole, si fut bien cremetous;

- Esmerade en apele, si li dist par iaz dous : 580
 Fol. 97r. "Fiz, tu as (tu as) grant biaté, si es trop convoitous,
 Et çaens at enfans et homes folious.
 Esta coi en ta cele, ne venir entre nous."
- LIX. Cant ot parlét o lui, Agapitun apele.
 "Fai toi et ton desciple, Esmerade, une cele. 585
 Bien li fai aorner que ele li soit bele,
 N'i soit a dire riens ne livre ne capele.
 Bien gart n'en isse fors ; trop est sa face bele.
 Ne vulh ke alhe mais en l'enclostre no[v]ele.
 Nostre frere en ont ja comencié tel querele. 590
 Comeüt en sunt ja come d'autre pucele,
 Mais or covient oster d'entr'iaz la miroële.
 Mar en orai ja mais ne tence ne favele."
- LX. La soue obedience reçoit Agapitus
 Et Esmerade oît que mise iert en reclus. 595
 Lie en est et joiose ; unque mais ne fut plus.
 Or voit que de sa vie n'irat mie a reüs
 Et croit que mut l'at chiere nostre sire Jhesus.
 Respont a son abét : "Pere, je nel refus.
 Ja, se tu nel commandes, ne passerai sor l'us." 600
 En se cuer loë Deu, le Sagnor de lasus :
 "Deus ki par ta mercit nos visitas ça jus,
 Voire car et voire arme de virgene receüs."
- LXI. Por nos pechiés fuz pris et loiés et batus
 Et jugiés a boisie et o larrons pendus 605
 Et posez el sepucure el sydone encosus ;
 Et visitas infer por retraire tes drus.
 Leviathan loias quis avoit retenus.
 En toi fut li serpens anciens deceüs.
- Fol. 97v. Morir te fist en crois et dist : 'Ciz est vencuz ; 610
 Cestui ne do ge mais, car toz est abatus.
 Purs hom est et non Deus ; or est toz conegus.'
 Ice pensoit de toi li fel, li deceüs.
- LXII. Por ce fut engigniés et ses regnés tolus.
 Pris fut o la vermine cum atre poissons mus, 615
 Car eres en la terre cumme caitis venus,
 Ta deïté coverte, d'umanité vestus.
 Ta car volt tranglotir ; o lance fut cosus,

- Cant par ta deïté fut pris et retenus.
Al tier jor surrexis et fus le jor veüs 620
Cinc fois a tes desciples et bien reconeüs.
O trois processions fuz el ciel receüs,
D'angeles et d'omes vis et de mors perseüs.
- LXIII. A le destre te pere sies [tu] rois posteïs.
D'illoc venras jugier et les mors et les vis 625
Et rendras a chascun ce qu'il arat conquis.
Qui bien t'arat servi recivrat paradis
Et li maleüreit descendront en abis.
Qui de toi partirat totens serat caitis;
Es mains al viel serpent Leviatan iert mis. 630
Qui en se ventre irat peris iert a tozdis.
Il ne prent raençon de nul de ses chaitis,
Ne quiert or ne argent, ne prendroit vair ne gris.
- LXIV. Chier sire, garde moi de la sue balhie.
Recuel le mien petit servise en ceste vie. 635
Tu conois me corage, ne m'estuet quel te die.
Tu seïs que je voroie estre la toue amie,
Mais nez estre t'ancele ne sui ge digne mie.
- Fol. 98r. Nuncporhuec si pensoie estre tote garie,
Cant je ere venue a l'ordne de moinie, 640
Mais tant sui pecheris, n'i puis estre soffrie
Entre la sainte gent, n'avoir lor compaignie.
Fors serai d'atre gent come Lazere mendie.
- LXV. Ensorquetot icë aloie je querant.
Or serai mise en canbre ensenble mon amant; 645
O lui consilherai des or a me talant.
N'orai ne ne verai mais riens a son pessant,
N'arai altre desduit le jor en me voilhant.
O lui iert mes pensez le nuit en me dormant.
Sire, toue mercit, or me mostre senblant, 650
Que ma petite amors toi soit auques en grant.
Le convers de ces omes aloie mut dotant,
Mais or m'as voie overte k'aloie desirant."
- LXVI. Eüfrosine astoit el renclus estable.
Agapitus la sert ki onques ne l'oblie. 655
Panutius en est alez de l'abeïe.
Cant fut a sa maison, si demandat s'amie.

- Li serf li ont conté: "Sire, n'en savons mie.
 Ersoir astoit çaens a ore de complie;
 Puis ne fut de nul home veüe ne oïe. 660
 Cremons ke ses espos l'ait enblee u ravie,
 A cui vos en faisiés, ce disoit, grant boisdie.
 Toliés li sa femme, cinc [ans] at, par folie.
- LXVII. Cant l'ot Panutius, mut devint esmariz;
 Sovent mue pensers; toz est descoleriz; 665
 Cerce(n)t de sa maison et cotes et voltiz,
 Que n'i soit malvais om o sa filhe atapiz.
 Fol. 98v. Cant ne le pot trover, toz en est esbahiz.
 A la maison al segre corut grains et mariz;
 Dist lor: "Or sui ge, cui, vergondez et laidiz, 670
 Cant en avez ma filhe amenee a mialtriz.
 Se je le soffre issi, dont soie je honiz.
 Tu ne seras mes segres ne cis serat mes fiz."
- LXVIII. Li seres li respont: "Nel deüsiés pas dire.
 Fol(i)és vos u gabez u vos parlez par ire. 675
 Ciz serat vostre fiz et vos serez ses sire,
 N'il ne vos honiroit; ans se lairoit ocire;
 Mais faites nos entendre ce que vos volez dire.
 La bele Eüfrosine, nuz de nos ne la vire."
 Cant l'ot Panutius, parfondement sospire; 680
 Deront sa blance crine et sa barbe detire
 Et la jube deront, le peliçon desire;
 Pasma soi tenrement; en l'apuie se vire.
- LXIX. Cant fut de pamisons Panuzes redreciez,
 Assis en la caiere l'escamel a ses piez, 685
 Comence un dol a faire: "Deus, ke sui engigniez!
 Perdue ai ma baldor; jor mais ne serai liez.
 Adiree ai ma filhe, dont sui grains et iriez;
 Ne sai kalz adversiers nos at si engigniez.
 Filhe, mut sui por vos, cinc ans at, travilliez; 690
 Or et argent et dras por vos apparelhiez,
 Faites riches maisons, manoirs edefiez,
 Por vos metre a honor, en tant ke vos viviez.
- LXX. Filhe, mais qui vos at de ma maison emblee?
 Kal lou vos ont ravie u morte u devoree? 695
 Prendre deviés sagnor. U estes vos alee?

- Fol. 99r. Ne ferez ja folie, car trop estes senee,
Ne de malvaise orine ne fustes vos pas nee.
Quise fustes a Deu. Il vos avoit donee.
Il ne sofferat ja que soiés violee. 700
Une rien sai ge bien, se vive estes trovee :
Por vos iert la citez d'Alixandre oneree,
Ne ja de malvaistié ne serez apelee.
- LXXI. Filhe, mut puis avoir grant dol et grant iror.
Norrie vos avoie a joie et a baudor, 705
Aprise dolcement et donee a honor.
De sens et de bonté vos portiez la flor.
Or vos en ont portee ne sai quel robeor
U alguns encantere at or la vostre amor,
Mais ja ce ne crerai, tant sai vostre valor. 710
Mut m'estes pres del cuer ; mut en ai grant dolor.
Vos me ferez morir a dol et a tristor.
Ja, tant que je vivrai, n'iert mais jors ne vos plor.
- LXXII. Filhe, por vos m'estuet sovent atendreier.
Segres, plore(s) ta bruz et tes fiz sa molhier. 715
Aidiez me le mien dol a crestre et exalcier.
Plorez vostre damage et jé me desturblier.
Je n'ai pas icest dol comenciét por laissier.
Ne me confortez ja ! Laissiez moi assasier.
Laissiez moi ce plorer que el siecle ou plus chier. 720
Om ne me poroit mais de plorer chastier,
Ne me dol oblîer, car oblîer nel kier."
- LXXIII. De[l] dol que fait li pere ne sai prout reciter.
L'espos de l'atre par se reprent a pasmer.
Cil ne vuet ne ne seit se dol amesurer. 725
- Fol. 99v. Tel dol at et tel ire ke ne puet mot soner ;
Le cuer gros et enflét qui nel lait sospirer
Ne les olz sol ovrir ne vers ome esgarder.
Panuzes s'esbahit del dol a[l] bachelier ;
Por poi ke ne li fait le sien dol oblîer. 730
Cant li segres le fait d'aige froide aroser
Et cil s'en esperit, si comence a plorer.
- LXXIV. A la froidor de l'aige s'esperit li espous.
Devant soi vit Panuze dolosant et granious.
Membre li de s'epose dont tant est dolerous. 735

Comence un dol a faire—anc n'oï tant pitous.
 "Eüfrosine bele, ke dirai ge de vous?
 Laissiét m'avez soltif et iriét et dotous.
 Soltif—car je n'amoie el siecle ne mais vous.
 Iriét—car perdu ai ce dont ere joious. 740
 Dotoz—car or ne sai par le quel de nos dous
 Moi est sobrecoruz ciz dolz tant perihlous.

LXXV. S'enver vos j'ai forfait, mut en sui vergondous;
 Nel fis mon esciant par Deu le glorious;
 Ans ai por vos estét prous et chevalerous; 745
 Ans ne fui en besog, se moi membra de vous,
 Que senpres ne fessise vert elme tot terrous;
 Mais des or serai vis et taisans et hontous.
 Gaberont soi de moi cil vasal folious;
 Demanderont: 'U est la drue a l'orgilhous? 750
 Il en faisoit les jostes et les tornois costous.
 Ja ne la sentirat de nuit soz le velous.'

LXXVI. Atre en arat les ris et les jous amerous;
 Et gé, que porai dire, li chaitis dolerous!
 Fol. 100r. Remetrai keme nois en un jor u en dous; 755
 Mais une riens croi jé, dont toz sui fiançons:
 Qui de vos dirat mal mentirat a estrous.
 Ja ne serez miatris ne je ne serai cous.
 Atre chose espoir jé, dont plus sui païroux:
 Traïtor vos ont morte por envie de nous 760
 Et l'avoir vostre pere ont enblé a estrous.
 Mal fust il aünez, cant perdue en ai vous.

LXXVII. Deus, ke dure aventure, cant perdue ai ma drue,
 Me cuer, me hardement, me conseil, mi' aïue!
 Or serai come turtre qui se per at perdue; 765
 N'irai mais al tornoi, ne ne poindrai par rue.
 Ja ne porterai mais enseigne a or batue,
 Ne brogne a or saffree n'iert mais par moi vestue.
 Jor mais chevalerie n'iert par moi maintenue.
 Mones serai en glise ma corone tondue. 770
 Ploreraï mes pechiez et la mort de me drue
 Et perdraï ma jovente cum esperviers en mue."

LXXVIII. Li segres voit le dol; mut se vo[i]t aïrier.
 Conforteir doit Panuze et se fil chastoier.
 Dist il: "Car vos laissiés des or mais consilhier! 775

- Tel dol vos voi ci faire qui bien fait a laissier.
Ne devez la pucele crier ne blastengier,
Ne le dol sordoloir, ne menzogne affichier.
Une riens sai de li—hom ne la puet noier—
Ans n'ot Eüfrosine le cuer vain ne legier, 780
Ne n'at ome soz [c]iel tant hardi ne si fier
Qui la filhe Panusce osast a mort jugier.
- LXXIX. Mais une riens espoir que vos vulh aco[i]ntier :
Fol. 100v. La donsele avoit Deu sor tote chose chier,
Ne ne fist ans senblant ke volsist noçoier, 785
Ne rist ne ne gabat devant nul chevalier.
G'espoir que a ceste ore est none a un mostier.
Envoions nos espies ; si le faisons cercier.
Se trovee i puet estre, faisons l'en repairier.
Nos ne l'i laisserons por cent livres d'or mier. 790
En la terre d'Egypte n'en at icel clergier
Que ne l'en venquisons, s'il en voloît plaidier."
- LXXX. Panutius oît le conseil bon et sage
Et li mescins s'atenpre un petit de sa rage.
Font crier par le vilhe le banc del segnorage : 795
Que il n'i ait nul home, ja soit de cel parage,
Se çoile la pucele, ne li quiere hontage,
Ja mais [n']ait del sagnor ne feu ne iretage.
Puis cercent l'abeie, le port et le rivage ;
Si s'en vont par Egypte totes pars li message ; 800
N'i remaint a cercier mestiers ne ermitage.
Li curliu ont en vain degasté lor voage.
- LXXXI. Et Panuzes at mis grant avoir en damage,
Ne n'ot de nule part senblant ne novelage.
A l'abé Teodose vat mostrer se damage. 805
"Sire, mut ai oût o toi grant amistage
Par ta grant saintité, par nostre comperage,
Par une moie filhe dont creïs mon linage.
L'atre jor la voloi[e] doner en mariage,
Mais or moi est enblee a dol et a damage, 810
Que je en ai tal dol, a poi que je n'enrage.
- LXXXII. Sire, car prie Deu cui sens par tot ataint,
Fol. 101r. Cui riens ne puet celer, ke ma filhe me raint ;
Qui doner le me pot, que rendre le me daint ;
U qu'ele soit alee, ke vive le ramaint. 815

Il voit me desier et le dol qui moi straint.
 Ocie moi de mort, ans que issi me paint.
 Si me serre li cuer, a pou qu'i[1] ne m'estaint.
 Ire et dolz me confont et pitiez me revaint.
 Ans ne n'ot nul amor cui ses cuers ne destraint, 820
 Ne besog n'ot d'aïe qui d'aïe se faint.

LXXXIII. Chier pere, aüe moi, qui en as postee—
 Le tien pooir ver Deu ai ge bien esprové—
 Et somon le covent, k'il en apele[nt] Dé.
 Ja contre lor proiere n'i arat rien celé, 825
 Ne ne serat ma filhe en si lointain regné
 Que la premiere nuit ne lor soit demostré."
 L'abes at le baron dolcement conforté:
 "Panuze, tu n'as rien que Deus ne t'ait doné.
 De toi et de ta filhe at il tot ordiné 830
 Et de toi et de li ferat sa volenté.

LXXXIV. Porhuec li pro[i]erons que par sa pieté
 Nos en face savoir se plaisir et se gré;
 Et tu remandras ore çaens en karité,
 Et diras de t'acointe a la fraternité. 835
 Om dolerous ne doit estre en soltivité.
 Li frere te feront mut bele humanité;
 Deu pro[i]eront por toi en tote humilité.
 Se ci ne prens conseil et confor enver Dé,
 Ja par ome vivant ne l'aras mais trové." 840
 Et Panuzes respont: "Consel m'avez doné.

Fol. 101v. Des k'en soie certains, n'irai mais a cité."

LXXXV. Panuzes est remeis en la sainte maison.
 L'abes et li covens font grant affliction,
 Et junent a efort o comune orison, 845
 Que Deus par sa pitié lor face a mostrison
 Savoir qu'est devenue la filhe a cel baron.
 Mandent a Esmerade par dant Agapiton
 L'aventure Panuze et sa petition,
 Qu'il en proiet a Deu, qu'il confort le baron; 850
 Face li de sa filhe tal revelation,
 Qu'il ne soit en dotance del trover u del non.

LXXXVI. L'abes et li covent se sunt mut travailhiét
 Por amor de Panusce qu'i[1] veoient iriét.
 Set jors ont jeüné et Deu en ont proiét. 855

Cant il ne lor respont, tot en sunt esmaiét.
Criement ke Deus lor soit irez por lor pechiét.
Por la virgene le fait a cui at s'amistiét;
Ne le volt contrister; mut en ot grant pitiét,
Car por amor de lui ot le siecle laissiét; 860
(Et) Se pere terrien at por lui renoiét;
N'at confor ne mais lui; por lui a tot cangiét.

LXXXVII. La bele Eüfrosine oît le mandement
Que li porte ses maistres et de part le covent.
Pitiét at de se pere et plore tenrement, 865
Car il l'avoit norrie suëf et dolcement;
Mais s'amor at a Deu qui ne frecist nient,
Qui le cors li escafe et le cuer li esprent.
Cuce s'en orisons, et prent venes sovent,
Et des larmes des olz sorfont le pavement; 870
Fol. 102r. Et fait sue orison si acemeement,
K'a son ordene obeïst et ver Deu n'en offend.

LXXXVIII. "Deus, ki nos enseignas pere et mere onerer,
Mais sor tote altre riens comandas toi amer,
De la tue amistiét je ne vuelh retorner 875
Ne l'amor de me pere ne puis mie oblïer.
Dans abes me comande a toi por lui oreir,
Que il poïst sa filhe en cest siecle troveir.
La sue obediencia je ne l'os refuseir.
Sire, je t'en apele; degne moi escuter! 880
Otroie li sa filhe si veoir et trover,
Que n'en conoisse mie jusk'a l'arme sevrer."

LXXXIX. A bries moz at la virge s'orison parfinie.
Deus at tot otroiét ce que li kist s'amie.
L'abes fut travailhiez et la sainte abeïe, 885
Mais la lor orison ne fut pas recolhie.
L'abes fut bien letrez et de grant cortesie;
Entres atres vertuz grase ot de prophesie.
Il conforte Panuse et sovent le castie:
"Frere, ne t'esmaier de travas d'este vie, 890
Car ceste vie est male et plaine de boisdie.

XC. Cant, ele aime plus l'ome, en riant le defie.
Lies puet estre li sers cui ses sires chastie,
Et li fiz cui ses peres destraint de sa folie;
Celui dont lui ne calt, tost l'a[t] mis en oblie; 895

- Puis vat come la nef cui la plete est falie.
 Menbre toi de l'ystore de Job et de Tobie,
 Que furent travilhié anbedui par envie.
 Tu plains une pucele qui t'est evanuë,
 Fol. 102v. Et Job en perdit trois et set fis en un die. 900
 Pleviis toi que ta filhe est en bune partie
 Et la veras encor et oras en ta vie."
- XCI. D'itant s'es[t] Panuzes un petit confortez.
 L'abeit et le covent at li bers saluez.
 Cant les ot un et un baisiez et acolez, 905
 A la cité s'en est a sa maison ralez.
 A Damedeu servir est trestoz atornez ;
 Fait longues orisons et larges charitez.
 N'at ermite en Egypte qui n'en soit visitez.
 A[z] mastiers d'Alixandre fait grandes largetez, 910
 Et de povres manoirs at alcans relevez.
 Az petis orfenins rent lor hereditez.
- XCII. Mais del dol de sa filhe ne se puet contenir,
 Et de jor et de nuit por li fait tant sospir.
 A l'abé Theodose l'en estuet revenir. 915
 Dist li sire : " Ne puis cest martyre soffrir.
 Por le dol de ma filhe me covenrat morir.
 Eüfrosine dame, que me faites fremir !
 Tant me penai de vos et aprendre et norrir ;
 Tant [fort] vos desiroie une fois a tenir. 920
 Entre vo[z] bras voroie ceste vie fenir."
- XCIII. L'abes vit le baron si forment esmaier ;
 Dist li : " Voroies tu a un mone acointier ?
 N'at plus esperital en tretot le mostier.
 Parler seit dolcement et ome consilhier. 925
 Que ke soit i poroies, estre puet, exploitier."
 Et Panuzes respont : " J'en aroi[e] mestier.
 Une gemme ai perdue que hom ne seit prisier,
 Fol. 103r. Ne n'at home soz ciel si sain ne si parlier,
 S'i[l]ne la moi rendoit, ki poïst apaier." 930
 L'abes fait devant soi Agapitus huchier.
- XCIV. L'abes fait la custode Esmerade apeler ;
 Dist li : " Vois cest baron que ne puis conforter.
 Le dol k'at de sa filhe ne puet pas oblier.
 En la cele Esmerade car le laissez aler 935

Ensemble te desciple ; li fai lui deparler.”
 Agapitus, li maistre, a fait l'uis defermer.
 N'en sot mot Esmerade, desque le vit entrer.
 Ele conut se pere, si comence a plorer.
 Les larmes de ses olz li veisiés filer 940
 Et par sa blance face jusk'al sain degoter.

XCV. Il ne la conut mie, ne s'en sot apenser.
 Que sa filhe soit mones qui poist esperer ?
 Pale astoit del renclus et maigre de juner,
 Fraite de malgesir et tainte de plorer. 945
 Il s'aproime ver li ; si se prent a doter ;
 Basse le capiron, si se vuet absconser.
 Agapitus li at fait signe de parler ;
 Dist li en se latin : “ C'est Panuzes li ber
 Qui sa filhe at perdue por cui tu sues orer. 950
 Dans abes le t'envoie ; pense del conforter ! ”

XCVI. Fissent lor orison, puis si se sunt assis.
 La virgene at le baron devant a raison mis.
 Comence se sermon des flors de paradis ;
 De la joie que Deus promet a ses amis 955
 A cui donrat corone[s] de roses et de lis—
 De lis a[z] confessors, de roses az martyrs ;
 Fol. 103v. Des paines ke trairont li chaitif en abys ;
 Cum doit estre kascuns desiros et pensis
 De conquerre la gloire ki durerat tozdis, 960
 Que ne puet cuer penser, ne ne la vit hom vis.

XCVII. Ci se doit l'om pener de servir Damledé
 Et ses comandemens obeïr a bon gré.
 Se il avient a l'ome aucune aversité,
 Soffrel en patiensce o tote humilité ! 965
 Par icele vertu sunt li saint esprové.
 Par li sunt li martyr travilhé et pené.
 Par grant travailh monta David en post[e]é.
 Par travailh vint Joseph sor Egypte el regné ;
 Puis ot grant oes a ciaz qui l'avoient geté. 970

XCVIII. Mes maistres le m'at dit ; ta filhe as adiree,
 Et l'as faite cercier par tote la contree,
 Et [en] ceste abeïe l'as assez demandee,
 Mais Deu ne plaist encor que ele i soit trovee.
Crede mi [que] ta filhe est bone part alee, 975

- Et tel conseil at pris dont ja n'iert retornee.
 Ne t'esmaier pas, sire! Ele iert encor trovee.
 A tes oez le veras sens nule recelee.
 S'ele ne fust en bien, Deus l'aüst demostree
 A ceste sainte gent ki tant en est penee. 980
- XCIX. Agapitus, mes maistres, le m'at dit des l'atr(e)ier,
 Que Panuzes li riches ert venus al mostier,
 Et somont le covent de Damledeu proier
 Que sa filhe li daint en sa vie enseignier.
 Moi en at fait mes maistres et juner et voilier 985
 Et proier Damledeu qu'i[l] te daint consilhier.
- Fol. 104r. De toi veoir avoie, certes, grant deseier
 Por sol toi conforter et por toi kastier.
 Amis, por coi t'ocis? N'i at nul recovrier.
 En cest dol ke tu fais ne pues rien gaagner. 990
- C. Ce que Deus at jugiét, vues le tu destorner?
 Il ordine les coses mies k'om ne seit penser;
 Ne lairat riens a faire del miez por te plorer.
 Il donat ses percepts por le siecle salver:
 K'om ne doit pere et mere contre Deu pas amer, 995
 Ans doit hom tot le siecle por sol lui adosser
 Et gerpir tote rien por lui sol akater.
 La pucele n'en fait, ce sai bien, a blamer,
 S'ele gerpit se pere por Damledeu amer,
 (Et) La terriene honor por le ciel hereter. 1000
- CI. Tu qui plus as vescu, kar le fai assiment,
 Et lais ester le dol qui ne te valt nient.
 Loe Deu de ta filhe ki la fait al plus gent.
 Le siecle at denoiét et gerpit castement.
 Qui atendroit el siecle alcun amendement, 1005
 Cil aroit, estre puet, ke d'ire, al jugement
 U n'arat rien celét; ne triche ne ne ment;
 Mais cil ki kascun jor voit ci l'enpirement,
 Que atent il el siecle? Feu durable et torment.
 Chiers amis, va t'en or! Je demor malement." 1010
- CII. Kant Panuzes oît la vois de la pucele,
 Ele li est plus duce ke harpe ne viele;
 Ans tal savor n'en ot ne pimens ne canele.
 Le congiét prist envis d'eissir fors de la cele.
 Piemement i[l] regrate l'arme de la donzele. 1015

- Fol. 104v. Cant fut Panutius eissuz de la chapele,
Et il trovat l'abét, dulcement l'en apele :
"Sire, toe mercit, parole ai oït bele,
Et m'est entree el cors une joie novele.
Mut par est de Deu plains li mone[s] de la cele. 1020
- CIII. Par sa dulce parole m'at (is)si esle[e]cié,
Que me cuer m'at rendut et si m'at kastoié,
Por pou n'ai de ma filhe tot le dol obliié,
Et ensemble icel frere ai pris tal amistié,
Tos me plore li cuers, por ce ke l'ai laissié. 1025
Mais or m'en vulh aler ; donez moi le congié !"
L'abes levat sa main, si l'at de Deu segnié.
Panuzes s'umilie, si li baise le pié.
Al partir ont ploré ambedui de pitié.
- CIV. Esmerades avoit toz biens [Deu] deservis, 1030
Trente et uit ans toz plains el reclus aconplis.
Deus li at ses labors et finez et meris.
Egrotez est li cors, car trop eret laidis,
De juner et de froit maiselez et blemis ;
Nel pot mais endurer ; a[1] lit est atapis. 1035
Mais cant li cors default, dont est fors li espris,
Car par nule enferté ne puet estre amatis.
Mut le sert dulcement ses bons maistre Agapis ;
Lies [est] de sa bone ore et de sa gloire fis.
- CV. Entretant est Panuzes a[1] mostier repairiez 1040
Et de sa carité fait les freres toz liez ;
Oït que Esmerade est a[1] lit aculciez.
Par le congiét l'abét est ver lui aproimiez.
Cant il le vit gesir, fort en est esmaiez.
- Fol. 105r. Il li baise les olz et les mains et les piez. 1045
Piement le regrate : "Frere, vos me laisiez !
Enpres vos remanrai esgarez et iriez.
[Après la vostre mort ne serai ja mes liez.]
De ma longe dolor vos me reconfortiez.
- CVI. Amis, or recomence ma paine et ma tristor. 1050
Tant que je vos ooie, ne sentoie dolor ;
En la vostre parole sentoie tal dolçor.
E[n]tre les innocens ait la vostre arme flor !
Ja ne vos ost veïr angeles de tenebror !
Ja ministres d'infer ne vos face paor ! 1055

Michaël vos enport(e) a joie et a baldor !
 El sain saint Abrahan soiés mis a honor !
 Et apostle et martir et tot li confessor
 Vos presentent a joie devant Nostre Sagnor !

- CVII. Amis, or recomence ma paine et mes ahans 1060
 Et li dol k'ai soffert, ui at trente et uit ans,
 Que je perdi ma filhe dont sui gries et dolans,
 Que vos profetiziés et jē ere atendants
 Que je la troveroie, mais or i sui fallans.
 Je l'esperoie bien ; folie est et nīans. 1065
 Ançois perdrai ge vos, cui ele ert si senblans ;
 Ans si senblans ne vi negun[s] gemel[s] enfans.
 Et por li et por vos morai grains et dolans.
 J'en irai en infer o les atres plorans."
- CVIII. La dame ert mut aflite de si grant enferté. 1070
 Voit se pere plorant et si desconforté ;
 Dist li : " Por coi t'ocis ? Tu ne crois verité ?
 Tu ne crois ke Deus ait vertu ne postee,
 Qui te puisse ta filhe rendre a sa volenté ?
- Fol. 105v. Membre toi de Jacob ki tant avoit ploré 1075
 Joseph ki fut venduz en estragne regné.
 Ploroit le come mort, puis le vit coroné.
 Or te pri ke trois jors me gars en karité ;
 Ne me gerpis tu ja, tros k'aie a toi parlé."
- CIX. Trois jors i fut Panuzes mut dotous et pensis 1080
 Et servit le malade cum ses privez amis ;
 Ne li soffre ses cuers que li soit point escis ;
 Et disoit en son cuer : " G'espoir que ans trois dis
 Et orai et verrai ce que lontens ai quis.
 Deus l'at a icest ome discover et apris, 1085
 Mais nel vuet dire encor ; crient en estre repris.
 Nel dirat puescelestre tant cum il serat vis,
 Mais cant iert en sa glore lasus en ciel assis,
 Manderat par un angele ce ke lui ert avis."
- CX. Ne demorat li termes ; li tier jors est venus. 1090
 Az genoz s'enclina ; devant lui est caüs.
 Dist li sire : " Jē ai tes termes atendus.
 N'alai puis nule part ; or te pri ke m'aiüs."
 Or conoist Esmerades que bien ert receüs
 Ses servises a Deu et ses cuers parcregus. 1095

Reclamat Damledeu et les sues vertus :
 "Sire, qui m'as esté avouez et escus,
 Par cui ai tant agu[a]i[z] trepasse[z]et vencus
 Et toz mes deseiers aconpliz et veüs !

- CXI. Sire, toe mercit, me cors as esgardé; 1100
 Or aten le corone de me droit avoué.
 Tu rendras le louier que tant ai désiré.
 Je l'aten et m'i fi, car tu dis verité
 Fol. 106r. Et es toues promesses n'at point de vanité.
 Me pere terrien ai ci fait demoré, 1105
 Car mut l'ai en cest siecle travelhié et pené.
 Sire, conforte le par ta grant pieté!"
 A son pere at la dame se viaire torné;
 Dist li: " Ne soie[s] mais de ta filhe en pensé.
- CXII. Ne soies en penser, car je sui la misele. 1110
 Je sui te chiere filhe cui tu norris pucele,
 Que tu metis jadis a letre en ta capele.
 Je sui Eüfrosine. Je sui icele bele.
 Mais se tu anc m'amas, or n'en faire novele.
 Çoile(a) nostre segré! garde n'en soit novel(e)e! 1115
 Garde que ne me voie frans ne sers ne ancele!
 Tu solz me sepelis estrainte en ma gonele.
 Apres ta sepulture fai faire ma formele,
 Le sepulcre ma mere a me senestre assele.
- CXIII. Cant je ving a cest ordene, je promis dant abé 1120
 En la terre d'Egypte k'avoie heredité,
 Et se Deus me donoit ici stabilité,
 Je la donroie tote a la fraternité.
 Aconpli ma promesse, sire, par amor Dé!
 Ne vulh estre reprise de tant de vanité. 1125
 Or me haste la mors. *Pater, ora pro me!*"
 A iceste parole rendit l'espír a Dé
 Qu'ele avoit sagement en cest siecle gardé.
 Sains Michiez le reçoit, qui li at présenté.
- CXIV. Li pere ot la parole, si est mut esmaris. 1130
 Voit le hastee mort, si at criét dous cris.
 Pamez chiet en la place; li sans li est fuís,
 Fol. 106v. A[z]cris est acoruz li bons maistre Agapis.
 Vit Esmerade mort gesir sor le tapis
 Et Panuze desore ki tos astoit roidis. 1135

D'aige froide l'arose, puis li at trois moz dis :
 "Qu'est-ce, sire Panuze? Este[s] vos endormis?
 A cel besoing ne doit prodom estre esbahis."

CXV. A grant paine se pot li bons pere esperir.
 Li cuers li est serez ki nel lait revenir. 1140
 Tant par fut excitez, si gete un grant sospir
 Et regarde le lit u le cors voit gesir;
 Devant soi vit le maistre plorer et paleir.
 Dist li sire: "Agapit, laissiés me ci dormir!
 Mervelhes ai oit ke ne pensai oïr. 1145
 Terre, por coi ne fens? Car te laisse entrov[r]ir
 Et reçoif le caitif cui ne dois sostenir!
 Enfer, oeuvre ta boche, si me viens tranglotir!

CXVI. Heü, ma chiere filhe! Dulce amie, heü!
 M'aïue et ma lucerne et ma joie, heü! 1150
 Eüfrosine, amie, que m'avez deceü!
 Tant vos avoie quise, tant avoie attendu,
 Mais or vos ai trovee et or ai tot perdu.
 Malemens sui menez; tot m'avez confondu.
 Le cors que ge norri, cum le m'avez tolu! 1155
 N'en ai ke le carpant et maigre et deronpu.
 Mut avez povrement en cest siecle vescu.
 [Trop vous estes celee; grant tort avez eü.]

CXVII. Filhe, pou at durét la nostre compagnie.
 Sempres vos ai trovee, sempres m'estes falie. 1160
 Ans ne fist mais pucele nule tal tricherie.
 [Filhe, por coi m'as fet mener si dure vie?]
 Ma filhe, u est la cars que j'avoie norrie?
 Fol. 107r. U sunt li olh riant? U est la chiere pie?
 U est la blance face? Mut est descolerie. 1165
 La vostre bele boche mut est tenve et palie.
 Laissiez moi, sire maistre, plorer la moie amie!
 Tant ke je vivrai mais, dolz soit la moie vie!

CXVIII. Ma filhe Eüfrosine! ma joie et mon deport!
 U troverai ge mais ne joie ne confort? 1170
 Mut sui malaiuros et mut ai dur resort.
 Or vos ai ge perdue et a vie et a mort.
 Et ver Deu et ver moi avez eüt grant tort.
 Se g'eüsse a garder icest cors qui ci dort,
 Ge l'auisse a ceste ore toz vertuos et fort; 1175

Mais cant en icest siecle n'en ai altre resort,
Vias non a Deu juise u resurdront li mort,
Me socorez a lui qui me maint a droi[t] port."

- CXIX. Agapitus oït la mervelhe si grant ;
Ans novele n'oït, si li fust a talant. 1180
Sor le cors at laissiét Panuze dolosant.
Il en vait a l'abé en l'enclostre corant ;
Conte li c'at veüt et oït en plorant.
L'abes sone la table, n'i vait pas demorant,
Et somont le covent, si cum ert covenant, 1185
K'en la cele Esmerade alhent a cors corant.
Trois cent en sunt eissut de l'enclostre cantant
Qui tot vont a socurs le psaltier versilhan.

- CXX. Illoc o[n]t le jor faite tante bele orison,
De tant bon coroné lete tante leçon, 1190
Tante vigile dite, recité tant sermon,
O tant bel luminare, o tante oblation.
Fol. 107v. Qui dont veïst l'abé entur Panution,
Cum il conforte bel et destraint le baron,
Ramembrer li poist de grant religion ; 1195
De l'atre part veïst le bon Agapiton,
Cum il garde le cors, cum il vait environ.
Fols est qui vuet morir sens tel ordinison.

- CXXI. L'abes at fait le cors gentement conreër,
Si que li comanda Panutius li ber. 1200
D'aloës et de myrre le fait enpimenter
Por les saintes reliques estoïr et garder ;
Puis la fait li bons abes en la biere poser.
Un pale alixandrin at fait sor li geter.
Por le presse l'en fait en la glise porter. 1205
Le vis fait descouvrir por le plus amirer,
Por les vertuz de li exalcier et loër.
Az genoz vait li viez devant li por orer :

- CXXII. "Eüfrosine dame, amie Damledé,
Filhe de sainte gent, exemples de bonté, 1210
Gemme d'atres puceles, flors de tote biaté,
Espose Jhesu Crist, temples de sainteé,
Prie le tien espous, nostre chier avoué,
Que maintigne cest liu par sa grant pieté ;

- Cresse-le et edifie et gart en netté. 1215
 Menbre toi de tes freres o cui as conversé.
 Prie Deu que lor doi[n]st part et heredité
 O toi et o les sains en sa halte cité!"
- CXXIII. El covent qui ert grans est uns mones venuz ;
 Olz avoit eüz biaz, mais l'uns en ert perduz. 1220
 Je ne sai l'oquison coment li fut toluz.
 Fol. 108r. Pensa ke par la virgene doit Deus faire vertuz ;
 Vit le cors en la biere dont li vis astoit nuz ;
 O parfite creance est a li acoruz ;
 Il la baise et li olz li est manes renduz. 1225
 Sachiez que cis miracles ne fut mie teüz ;
 Ans est de l'abeie en la cité coruz
 Et de la grant cité par la terre espanduz.
- CXXIV. Panutius li fist mut bele sepulture.
 Le sepucure de marbre ot bone entalheüre. 1230
 De la geste a la virgene i at fait esriture
 Qui mais n'iert obliee, tant ke li siecle dure.
 Panuzes plaint sa filhe, si que requiert nature,
 Mais l'abes Teodoses est lies de l'aventure ;
 Reliques at certaines et de sa norreture. 1235
 La verté de l'ystore at mis[e] en letreüre,
 Si limee et si vraie, si loial et si pure,
 Que om n'i puet trover un mot de troveüre.
- CXXV. Panuzes at sa filhe sevelie et ploreë.
 Almone fait por li mirable et honeree, 1240
 Ne n'at glise en la vilhe ne soit enmelhoreë ;
 N'at povre en la cité qui n'en ait sa livree.
 A l'abé Teodose porte sa recelee ;
 S'eredité la riche at a[l] mostier donee.
 E[n] la cele sa filhe at sa vie muee. 1245
 Illuc gist sor la nate u il l'avoit trovee.
 Dous ans qu'i vescit puis, at tal vie menee
 Que ne vestit chier drap, n'ot sa chiere lavee.
 Or en est l'abaie proisie et renomee.
- CXXVI. Mones fut a estros, tant cum il puis fut vis, 1250
 Fol. 108v. Et si obediens ke n'en fut ans repris.
 Sire abes Teodoses, tu l'amas et servis ;
 Tu[l] gardas en sa vie et mort le sevelis

- El sepulcre entalhié a flor, de marbre bis.
 Tu nos soies o lui a Deu bons plaidois ! 1255
 Et tu, sainte pucele, apele lo tozdis
 Qu'i[l] nos soit al besoing merciabls et pis ;
 Cant il venrat jugier et les mors et les vis,
 Pardoinst nos no pechiez et nos doi[n]st paradis.
- CXXVII. Eüfrosine dame, Deu espose et amie, 1260
 Ne te nom ne ta geste ne coniso(i)ie mie.
 En un livre d'armare vi escrite ta vie.
 Simplement astoit dite d'(el) anciene clergie.
 Ore cant je l'ou liute, reçui t'avou[e]rie ;
 Por t'amor ai ta vie en romans recoilhie, 1265
 Non por li amender par maior cortesie,
 Mais par ce ke je vulh qu'ele plus soit oïe.
 S'atres t'aimet o moi, je n'en ai nule envie.
 Tot le siecle en voroie avoir a compaignie.
- CXXVIII. Le mien petit servise recivez par amor. 1270
 Se je ne l'ai fait bien, je l'ai fait par dolçor.
 Apele Deu por moi, nostre chier redemptor,
 Qu'il ait de moi mercit, le chaitif pecheor ;
 Ne les mie[n]s grans forfais ne mes toz a iror ;
 Prende droit en cest siecle d'icest sien boiseor 1275
 Et me laist parvenir, et o june et o plor
 Des pechiez que j'ai fais, devant me jugeor ;
 Et tu, sainte pucele, franque rien, dulce flor,
 En itant moi meris m'entente et me labor. Amen.

NOTES

11. MS. O has *ancionor*. Paul Meyer who printed the first strophes of the poem in his *Documents Manuscrits* has changed it to *ancianor*. The editor has preferred *ancienor*, since we have *anciens* 609 and *anciene* 1263. For other instances of the survival of the Latin gen. pl., cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.*, II, §7.

12. Another case of this unusual *gentior* occurs in 332. In both instances ABH have *meillours*, which seems to show that the MS. from which they are derived substituted a more usual word for the uncommon form.

15. O has *par*, ABH *por*, *pour*. The regular Old French form is *por chierté de as por amor de*, cf. Tobler, *Verm. Beit.*, I, 70. For other cases where O has *par* in opposition to the other MSS. cf. 39, 62, 95, etc. Numerous examples of *par* for *por* occur in *Poème Moral*: 39b, 159d, 298b, etc.

23. For justification of the correction of *espoit* to *exploit*, cf. the editor's note in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXII, 458 ff.

36. The *-t* is always retained in *-atem* > *-eit*. There are examples of *-eit*, *-ét*, *-é*, but never of *ei*: *abeit* 36, 64, *abét* 599, 1017, *abé* 10, 44, never *abei*.

48. *posteis* [*potestat-ieu*] occurs in a variant to *Yvain*, 1607, beside *poësteis*. MS. O knows only the shorter form, cf. 129, 151, 624 and *postéé* 822, 1073.

60. O *fies*.

67. O *des hom*.

68. *mon*. The loss of final *-t* foll. a nasal is a well known Walloon trait, cf. *Rom.*, XVII, 563 ff. For other cases in this poem, cf. *boban* 231, *avinan* 233 (both proved by rhyme) *argen* 54, *can* 357, *aten* 1101, etc.

77. *kier* is pr. 3. For other cases of loss of final *-t* after *r*, cf. *confor* 839, 862, *discover* 1085, *par* 724, *cuer* 525.

78. Since the usual form of Latin *si* is *se* and since in MS. O final *l* frequently disappears when the foll. word begins with a cons. (*qui* for *qu'il* 163, 224, a for *al* 56, 66), I have corrected *si* to *s'il*.

79. *se* instead of *son* in masc. acc. is found in 79, 156, 170, 245, 390, etc. (20 cases). There are also examples of *me* and *te* for *mon* and *ton*. This trait is a peculiarity of the No. Walloon according to Wilmotte (*Rom.*, XVIII, 218) who cites some of these examples.

85. "Never had one heard of a girl of such sense and beauty since the Virgin Mary." For *oir* in this meaning, cf. *Troie*, 14146, 23182.

88. *adont* = *adonc*. Cf. *dont* = *donc* 542, 672, 1036

90. The final *t* of *crestienteit* is partly erased. In MS. O there is a tendency to write this *t* and there are several instances of erasure as in *heredité* 153. — *Eüfrosie*. Elsewhere throughout the poem the protagonist is called *Eüfrosine*. The latter form is found twice in rhyme (111, 494). In ABH the initial vowels (*Eu*) of the name form but one syllable, whereas in O they count as two. This difference has naturally produced other divergencies between the MSS.

97. The nom. *abeis* instead of *âbes* is proved by the versification. This form is built on the acc. *abeit*. Elsewhere we have *âbes* 61, 93, 215, etc. In 276, 348 *âbes* is proved by the verse. O *san*.

115. *dogies*. Change of pretonic *e* to *o* as in *promier* 325, *donier* 324, etc.

117. *deruie*. For *ruie* and *rue*, cf. Foerster, *Yvain*, small ed., 4327 n., *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, 588 n., *Erec*, 119 n., *Charrette*, 5685 n. In *Cligés*, 1907, 3429 *ruie* rhymes with *enuie*, *fuie*. Foerster explains the *i* as a glide sound due to the position of the tongue in changing from *u* to *é*. In *Rom.*, XXXI, 449 n. Gaston Paris has pointed out that *dervient* put by Godefroy under *desvier* should be corrected to *deruient* < *deruer*. The form *deruire* listed by Godefroy should be changed to *deruer*.

123. *amelive* which is not cited by Godefroy may be taken as fem. of adj. *amelif* derived from *amieler* (*séduire*), on the analogy of *meslif* < *mesler*. The meaning of *séduisant* is appropriate in this passage. One might also consider it a mistake for *anelive* < *aneler* [anhelare]. Of *anelif* Godefroy gives but one example, which is from the poorly edited *Vie de S. Edward*. The meaning of "impatient" would fit that passage as well as our text. I prefer the first interpretation since it gives a satisfactory meaning without altering the text.

129. "They seek her for a bride." Cf. *desirrer à seignor*, *Yvain*, 5476. The *le* as fem. pron. is found also in 150, 210, etc. There is no elision because of the emphasis, cf. *Lais de Marie de France*, ed. Warncke, p. XXVII.

139. O *la lor*.

151. *astoit*, never *estoit*, in O. This is also the form used in *Poème Moral* and *Li Ver del Juise* of the same MS.

171. O *vint li*.

185. O *lor iors*.

198. Is *non* a Latinism like *uxor*? *Non* is used as the regular negative only in the early monuments. Later it is employed with *faire*, *avoir*, *estre*, etc. when these verbs are really auxiliaries, cf. Diez III, 319, 436 and *Zeit. f. r. Ph.*, II, 2. In the present case it seems to be a survival of the use in the older texts and introduced for emphasis.

200. *aiue* occurs also in 425 and 764; in the latter case it rhymes with *perdue*. *aiue* is found in 478 and 821. A similar use of both forms in the same text has been noted by R. Jungbluth in *Rom. Forsch.*, X, 632 in his study of the language of the Cistercian Rules, a text from the N.E. In our text the imperative of *aidier* is *aiue* 191 and *ave* 822. For *aiue* as substan. and verb, cf. *Poème Moral*, p. 114.

201. It is obvious that the *espoitier* of O = *exploitier* which is the form of ABH in this case and given by all the MSS. in 342. Cf. *exploit* 23 and note.

202. MS. O has *fetoralhes*. Since *k* and *h* resemble each other in the writing, I have changed to *fait or alkes* which fits the sense, if *eslonges* is taken as a noun.

220. The *chasteit* of O is clearly a scribal error, as *neteit* 223 (*neteé* 412, 1215). There are numerous examples in O of *ei* < *a* and in such cases the isolated *t* which has become final is retained, cf. *abeit* 36, 64, 81, etc., *greit* 83.

225. *livre* = Bible. Cf. *Poème Moral*, 153a, 160a.

231. *boban* = *bobant*, verbal substantive from *bobancier*. Cf. *Lai du conseil*, v. 146n, *Rom. Forsch.*, XXXI, 799 ff., and *Z.R.Ph.*, XXII, 509.

233. *Rebecca*. Cf. *Genesis*, XXVII.—*Rachel*. Cf. *Gen.*, XXIX, 17. "*Rachel decora facie, et venusto aspectu.*"

236. For this use of *de* with verbs of perception, cf. Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.*, I, 17, 18.—In the Vulgate where the story of Susanna is narrated in *Daniel*, XIII, the men who falsely accuse her and who are finally condemned are called *senes iudices*, vv. 5, 41, *senes*, vv. 19, 24, 27, and *presbyteri* vv. 28, 34, 36, 61. Now in Latin *presbyterus* means not only an elder, but a priest and at times a bishop, cf. Du Cange. According to this authority *papas* and *papatus* were both used to denote *clericus* and *sacerdos*. So it is not surprising that the *presbyteri* should be called *papi*. It was under Gregory VII that a council of Rome reserved the title of *papa* for the head of the Roman Church. In the Greek Church the word is still used to signify 'priest.' The suffix *-anus* was used to form substantives designating the inhabitant of a country (*Persanus*, *Romanus*) or a rank (*decanus*). *Paban* is thus a semi-learned form derived from *papanu*, whereas *doien* < *decanu* and *païen* < *paganu* have the popular development. For the story of Susanne in Old French lit., cf. Eustache Deschamps, *Le Miroir de Mariage* in *Œuvres*, IX, pp. 145–150.

238. *Manmucan* was one of the seven chamberlains of king Ahasuerus and their spokesman. Cf. *Esther*, I, 14–21. The Vulgate gives *Mamuchan*, whereas the Eng. version has *Memucan*.

252. *si* at counts as one syl. as in 518, where the same hemistich is found; elsewhere *si* is in hiatus, cf. 435, 516, 555, etc.

261. Vita: *Deus, qui cognosis hominem antequam nascatur.*

265. *O grande.*

282. *O il ne ni.*

291-303. Vita: *Dic mihi pro caritate, domine mi Frater, quanti Fratres estes in monasterio. At ille dixit: Trecenti quinquaginta duo (Mombritius: trecenti quadraginta et duo). Dixit ei puella: Qui voluerit venire illic ad conversionem, suscepit illum Abbas vester? Respondit ei: Etiam cum multo gaudio suscepit illum, maxime propter vocem Domini, qui dixit: Qui venit ad me, non ejiciam foras. Dixit ei Euphrosyna: Omnes in ecclesia vestra psallitis, et aequaliter jejunatis? Dixit ei monachus ille: Communiter quidem psallimus, jejunia vero unusquisque quomodo vult, aut quantum valet, ut non fiat contumax voluntatis conversatio, sed proprii arbitrii et spontanea voluntate.*

N.B., the different order of the questions in the Latin version.

297. In this verse both uncontracted and contracted forms of *jeûner* are attested by all the MSS. For other examples, cf. *Rom.*, VIII, 96 f., *Poème Moral*, 46c, 277c, 374b.—For another reference to the fact that fasting is not obligatory in monastic life, cf. *Poème Moral*, 565 f.

333. *O m. un pou mi e ancois a.*

336-339. Vita: *Dicit ei monachus ille: Ecce pater tuus veniet tecum ad monasterium, et faciet ibi tres dies vel quatuor.*

347. Vita: *Quid ad nos fastidium sumpsisti, domine?*

348. *O sens.*

354 and 361. Vita: *ingressusque cum eo in naviculam, abierunt in monasterium Theodosii.*

365. Vita: *ecce quidam monachus veniebat de monasterio, vendens quae secum habebat.*

366. For this custom, cf. L. Duchesne: *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, II, 500: *Les moines communiquaient régulièrement avec Alexandrie: ils avaient des bateaux qui faisaient le service entre leurs diverses colonies et descendaient jusqu'à la capitale, pour y vendre les produits de leur travail et acheter les objets qui leur étaient nécessaires.*

395-402. Vita: *Dominus dicit, si quis non abrenuntiaverit patrem et matrem et fratres et filios insuper et propriam animam, non potest meus esse discipulus. Ego tibi plus dicere nescio.*

403. The *me* of *O* is impossible. Instead of adopting the *ton* of ABH, I have introduced *te* the usual form in *O* (*te* 9 cases, *ton* 3 cases). Cf. 79 note.

403-405. Vita: *Tamen si potes ferre tentamenta carnis, relinque omnia, et fuge.*

410. The use of *penses* instead of *pense* may be due to the influence of the preceding *tu*. For the use of the *pr.* as imperative, cf. D. Engländer, *Der imperativ im altfranzösischen*, p. 4. Cf. *Et penses de tost revenir*, Montaignon, *Fabliaux*, III, 153.

416. Since this is almost the only case in *O* where *a* is found for *at* and since it may be due to a confusion with *apris*, I have adopted *at*.

419, 420. If both of these verses are retained, we have a strophe of 21 verses. Neither of the verses is found in ABH where the rhyme group consists of 19 vv. Either of the lines might be omitted without impairing the continuity of the poem, but since it is uncertain which of the two is less likely to be

genuine, it seems best to include both. However it should be noted that usually in the instances where the same rhyme is continued for twenty or thirty verses, there is a pause in the sense at the end of each group of ten, cf. 330. In the case of this strophe there is no such pause after the tenth, whereas there is a slight break after 423. This may show that there is an extra verse in strophe XLII rather than in XLIII.

432. Cf. *Jam enim securis ad radicem arborum posita est*. S. Matthew, III, 10; S. Luke, III, 9. Cf. also, *A la raix de l'arbre est mise la cuignée*, *Vie de Saint Johan*, v. 211, publ. in Intro. to *Vie de Saint Gilles par Guillaume de Bernesville*, p. 6 ff.

439. Whether we accept the date of S. Euphrosine's death as 470 (*Acta Sanctorum*) or 394 (*Mombritius*), there is evidently an anachronism in any case, for the order of S. Benedict was not founded until 529. May it not be that the author of the French poem was a Benedictine and wished to claim the saint for his order?

448. The unusual form *anele* appears to be due to a change of suffix (-*ela* for -*ellu*). Cf. Catalan *anel* and *anella*.

468. The first *si* is the conjunc. [*si*], the second the adverb [*sic*]. "If she goes and takes refuge with the nuns, even though she be in a religious house, she will be sought, etc."

483. *por cui amor*. For this construction, cf. Foerster's ed. of *Yvain*, note to v. 2 and Tobler: *Verm. Beitr.*, I, 69. This construction survives in modern Italian.

495. *cansil*. For a description of the manufacture of this cloth, cf. *Poème Moral*, 312.

503. O *gens*.

508. *acuttee*. O has *aquitee*, but the past part. of *aquiter* does not give a satisfactory meaning. The *Vita* has *abscondit se in aliquo loco per totam noctem*. Since the rest of this verse is such a close translation of the Latin, it is reasonable to conclude that *si est aquitee* represents *abscondit*. Godefroy gives *s'acutir* (*se cacher*) with one example. He also cites numerous cases of *cuter* (*cacher*). This meaning corresponds so exactly to the Latin and fits the context so well that there is good reason to assume that the original form was *acuttee*. This is supported by the *acoutee* of ABH.

525. *cuer* = *cort*. The diphthongisation of checked *o* is a peculiarity of the North East. For loss of *t* cf. 77n.

542-545. *Vita*: *Et protulit quingentos solidos in manu Abbatis, dicens: Accipe interim istos, et si videro quia possim sufferre hic, venient et illa reliqua.*

560. O *an te*.

561. O *p. siz seuit*.

580. *par ias dous* = *à eux deux seuls*. ABH have *amis dous* [*dulcis*] rhyming *s* and *s*, something unknown in O.

583. O *Esta toi*.

591. *come d'altre pucele* = "as by any maiden." For *altre* = "any" cf. *Diez* III, 84, 3, 1.

592. *miroele* is not mentioned by Godefroy. However it appears to be the correct reading, since it is found in all four MSS. It is connected with *mिरer*—"to look at attentively," and seems to mean a person who attracts the glances of others. Cf. the modern slang *miroir à putains*, *miroir à grues*.

611. *do*—The loss of final *t* is due to the initial of the following pronoun. Cf. *Aiol*, 1783 and Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.*, p. 159.

669. *segre* [söceru]. In MS. O there is a tendency to simplify the diphthongs *ue* > *u*, *ie* > *i*, etc. However not only does the second element frequently disappear, but at times the first element is sacrificed to the second as in this case. This word occurs six times and O has always *segre(s)* except in 674 where the palatal falls giving *seres*. B has usually *suegre(s)*, H *seure(s)* and A through error *sire(s)*.

679. *vire* = *virent*. This appears to be a case of assonance or else the final consonants have become silent. In *Poème Moral*, text of MS. O, there are several examples of the loss of *-nt* in 3rd pl.: *soffre* 72d, *devoie* 358b, *demandet* 378c, etc. At other times *-nt* is added to 3rd sing. as in *desirent* 333b which rhymes with *ire*. This shows that at least in the dialect of the copyist *-nt* was probably not pronounced. For these and other examples, cf. *Poème Moral*, p. 107.—For a pl. verb after such expressions as *nus de nos*, cf. Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.*, I, 231.

682. *desire* = *descire*. For another example of *descirer*: *detirer*, cf. *Yvain*, 1157 f.

*Aussi come fame desvee
Se comancoit a descirer (v. dessirier)
Et ses chevos a detirer.*

695. *Vita: quis putas lupus agnam meam dissipavit?*

717. The *l* is inserted in *desturblier*, perhaps by analogy with *trabler* [*turbulare*].

722. O has a strophe of only nine verses; ABH have but eight. Since in O the strophes usually consist of ten verses, it is probable that one verse has been lost. Whether the omitted line belonged at the end of the strophe or elsewhere it is impossible to determine absolutely. On account of the lack of connection between 721 and 722, it seems likely that there may have been a verse between them in the original poem.

746. *besog* is a well known Picard and Walloon form. Cf. 821 and *Chev. as Il espes*, p. L, Jungbluth, *o. c.*, p. 618, Neumann, *Laut- u. Flexionslehre*, p. 40.

787. O *a cest m*.

796. O *nnt home*.

797. "Let no one, even though he be of this family, if he be hiding the maiden, seek her dishonor."

798. The *n'* needed before the verb has been supplied from ABH.

804. O *neuelage*.

808. *creis*. One would expect *creüs*, just as *receüs* 603. Cf. *Z. R. Ph.*, II, 255 ff.

809. I have corrected *voloï* to *voloie*, since *-oie* is the usual form in O. The imperf. in *-oie* is proved for the author in 1152, 1163, cond. in *-oie* 391, 531, 1123.

813. *cui riens ne puet celer* = "From whom nothing can be hidden." The reflex. pronoun is omitted or else *celer* is used as a neuter verb. The general idea of this line is expressed in *Ezechiel*, XXVIII, 3, *omne secretum non est absconditum a te*; Eng. version: "there is no secret that they can hide from thee." Cf. also *devant deu ne se puet nus celeir*, *Poème Moral*, 149d and *Diex*, *qui quenuis chascune chose, Vers cui riens ne puet estre anclose, Vie de Ste.*

Paule, 745 f.—*raint*, as far as the form is concerned, may be taken as the pr. subj. of either *ramer* or of *raisnier* [*rationare*]. The first would not accord with this passage, since the father does not fear that his daughter has ceased to love him, but he thinks that she has been spirited away. *raint* [*rationet*] offers a reading which is quite satisfactory. There seems to be a touch of irony, for this prayer is answered, P's daughter talks many times with her father, but she is so disguised that he does not recognize her. Another possible solution would be to read *m'amaint* instead of *me raint*. ABH have *m'amaint* both in 813 and 815. This repetition is doubtless an error and might indicate that the original poem had *m'amaint* in 813 and that the MS. from which ABH are derived had repeated this word in 815, substituting it for *ramaint*. There is no doubt that *m'amaint* suits the context excellently and corresponds closely with *que rendre le me daint*, 814.

856. *O Tant il.*

864. *de part* for *de par* of 485. Final *t* following *r* frequently falls, showing that it was not pronounced in the dialect of O. It is therefore not surprising to find *t* added, especially in this case, where there is a confusion with *part* [*partie*] in such expressions as *de ma part*.

869. *cuce s'en*. For other examples of enclisis of the personal pronoun foll. a verb, cf. a similar verse in *Vie de S. Alexis*, 357: *vienent devant, getent s'ad oreisons*. For the attitude of prostration in prayer, cf. 478.

881. *O si sauoir*; ABH *si ueoir*.

895. "One soon forgets the man for whom one has no concern."

896. *plete*. There is a Latin *plecta* (Gk. πλεκτός) which DuCange translates: *nexio cum virgulis; nexus ex virgulis, vel papyro, vel carecto factus, unde cofinos faciebant*. From this form we should expect an O. F. *plite*, as *lectu* > *lit*. Since however in our poem we have *lete* [*lecta*] in 1190 which is a Walloon form, it is not surprising to find *plecta* > *plete*. The meaning "a knot of a cable" suits the context. According to Jal's *Glossaire Nautique* there is also a form *plet*, which he translates: *un des tours d'un cordage, et also apleitage: lieu où les vaisseaux abordent pour charger ou décharger des marchandises*.

918. *dame*. The scribe of O appears to have first written *f* and then superposed a *d*, as if he had begun to write *filhe* or *feme* and then corrected himself. Other examples of *dame* used in addressing Euphrosine are in 1209, 1260.

926. "You would perhaps be able to accomplish anything whatsoever by this means."

927. *j' en aroie*. *O je en aroi*. There are three cases of imperf. and cond. in *-oi* (809, 927, 1261), while *-oie* is the usual form of O and is the only one proved for the author of the poem. All three exceptions lend themselves easily to emendation, and each change is discussed in a note to the verse where the form occurs. In the present case we have the only instance of *je en* in hiatus, whereas in 352 and 1069 the elision is proved. We are therefore restoring the language of the poet, when we suppress the hiatus of *je en* and add *-e* to the termination of the verb. In *Poème Moral*, *-oi* and *-oie* are both frequently found and both forms are proved by the verse.

943. *O none*; ABH *mones*.

944. 5. *Vita: quia species vultus emarcuit prae nimia abstinentia, vigiliis et lacrymis*.

946. *Sc. ele* with *se prent*.

947. *Vita: De cuculla autem operuit faciem suam, ne aliquo modo agnosceret eam.*

952. *Vita: Facta autem oratione sederunt.*

957. *martyrs*, instead of *martyrs*, shows a weakened pronunciation of *r* before *s*.

968. For other cases of *postel*, cf. note to v. 48, and *Poème Moral*, p. 85.

969. *vint . . . regné*, "came into power over Egypt."

993. "Your weeping will not keep him from doing what is best." *plorer* is used as *substan*.

994-7. *Vita: secundum vocem Evangelii, qua dicitur: Qui diligit patrem aut matrem super me, non est me dignus. Et si quis non abrenuntiaverit omnibus quae possidet, non potest meus esse discipulus.*

1003. *ki la fait al plus gent* = "who acts most nobly in this matter." There are several examples of *la* between *ki* and verb in *Poème Moral* (15b, 33b, 456d, 470d).

1026. *O denes*.

1036. *O espirs*. The editor has corrected so as to conform with the language of the poet.

1048. This verse is not found in O, but is given by the other three MSS. The principal justification for including it in the text is that without it the strophe has but nine lines, whereas ten is the usual number. The verse repeats the thought expressed in 1047 and the rhyme word *liez* occurs also in 1041, which are two reasons for doubting the authenticity of the line. There are however in the poem other cases where the rhyme word is repeated in the same strophe. Since in ABH both this verse and the preceding begin with the same word (*apres*), the same may have been true of the source of O. If such were the case, the scribe of O might carelessly have omitted the second line, as often happens when two consecutive lines begin with the same word.

1057. The curious form of *scuerr* (O) appears to be the result of an attempt to write *sain* and *cuer*. The context would lead one to expect *sain*; cf. *S. Luke, XVI, 22, et portaretur ab Angelis in sinum Abrahae*. Might not the change to *cuer* be due to an effort on the part of the scribe to avoid the combination *el sain saint*? For an example in Old French, cf. *Que dex el sain saint Abrahan, Perceval* (ed. Baist), 2928.

1069. *Vita: jam descendam lugens in infernum.*

1071, 2. *Vita: videns autem eum Smaragdus vehementer plorantem et nullam consolationem recipientem, ait ad eum: Quid turbaris et temetipsum interficis?*

1073. *Vita: numquid invalida est manus Domini, aut quidquam est Deo difficile?*

1075-9. *Vita: Recordare quomodo Patriarchae Jacob manifestaverit Deus Joseph, quem quasi mortuum lugebat. Sed obsecro te, ut per tres dies me non deseras neque derelinquas.*

1087. *Puescelestre*. The *sc* is the result of the result of the assimilation of the final *t* of *puet* and the initial consonant of the following syllable. The *Poème Moral* has *puescestre*, 290a, 341a, *puessestre*, 95c. The *cel* is usually Norman or Ang. Nor. Cf. Menger: *The Anglo-Norman Dialect*, p. 117; Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.*, II, 135; Walberg: *Bestiaire de Philippe de Thaün*, LXXV. Elsewhere in the poem (926, 1006) *estre puet* is found.

1092, 3. Vita: *expectavi sicut rogasti, domine mi Frater, et non discessi alicubi per tres continuos dies.*

1098. *vencus* shows by its plural form, which is proved by the rhyme, that the *aguit trepasse* of O should be plural also. The other MSS. confirm this. *Aguait* is proved by rhyme in 319, so I have corrected to *aguais trepasses*. For *tant* before a plural noun (*tant chevaliers*, etc.) cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.*, III, §53; *Aiol et Mir.*, notes to 2522, 4487.

1110. Vita: *nolo autem te jam esse sollicitum pro filia tua Euphrosina, ego enim sum illa misera.*

1120-1124. Vita: *Et quia promisi Abbati habere multas possessiones, et si potuissem sustinere et perdurare in loco isto, adducerem eas hic. Imple ergo quod promisi.*

1126. Vita: *et ora pro me. Haec dicens tradidit spiritum.*

1131. *hastee* = "swift." For the perf. part. in active sense, cf. Tobler: *Verm. Beitr.*, I, 146 ff.

1136-7. Vita: *jactavit aquam super faciem ejus elevavit eum, dicens: Quid habes, domine mi Paphnuti?*

1144. O *dormir*, ABH *morir*. The latter is more graphic and reproduces the Latin Vita: *Dimitte me ut hic moriar, vidi enim mirabilia hodie.*

1147. O *recois*; *stostenir*.

1156. O *carpam*.

1158 and 1162. These verses have been supplied from ABH in order to make strophes of the usual length.

1161. O *tat*.

1169. O *La filhe*.

1176. MS. O has *resort*, not *tresort*, so the correction made by Paul Meyer in his *Recueil* was unnecessary.

1236. From this point the text of O is quite different from that of the other MSS.

1247. In Paul Meyer's *Recueil* where the conclusion of the poem has been printed according to O, the editor has supplied *at* after *ans*. This makes an excess of syllables in the verse and besides is quite unnecessary, for *qu'i vescit puis* is merely parenthetical.

1257. Meyer prints *qu'i*, but there is a tendency for final *i* to fall in the language of the scribe. Furthermore there is no reason for *i* in this case.

1261. *conisoie*. The MS. has *conisoi ie*, but the scribe usually writes *-oie* for the imperf. and cond.

Besides *-oie* is proved for the imperf. in 1152 and 1163, for the cond. in 247, 391, 531, 1065, 1123. There are three cases of *-oi* and all three lend themselves easily to emendation. The editor therefore feels justified in adopting *conisoie*, a correction already made by Meyer.

1263, 4. The two corrections in the text had already been made by P. Meyer in his *Recueil*.

1279. The editor has prepared a study of the language of the poet and the phonology of MS. O, as well as a chapter on the versification and another on the classification of the four MSS.

GLOSSARY

- Abe 359, *dawn*.
 afeit 32, *insult*.
 amier 163, *join in friendship, make friends*.
 amite 499, *costume of fine fabric*.
 anele 448, *finger ring*.
 armare 1262, *library*.
 assiment 1001, *likewise*.
 astamine 495, *light fabric of wool or cotton*.
 avinan (= avenant) 233, *attractive, charming*.
 aviros 307, *rich*.
 Bandon; a b. 386, *according to his desire*.
 Can 248, *singing*.
 cansil 495, *a cloth made from flax*.
 cap 521, *head*.
 carpant 1156, *frame (of the body)*.
 castré 515, 525, *eunuch*.
 chasal 271, *building, house*.
 cieü 480, *blind*.
 codron (*fut. 4 of cueillir*) 540, *receive*.
 cor 295, *chorus*.
 cosus, *p.p.* 618, *pierced*.
 cous 758, *cuckold*.
 cucuer [*collocare*]; pr. 3 cuce 869, *prostrate*.
 cueillir; *imper.* cuil 264, *receive*.
 curliu 802, *courier*.
 Denoier 1004, *reject, abandon*.
 deruer 117, *strike, beat*.
 derver 569, *become mad*.
 desrainier 207, *explain, justify*.
 do 611, *pr. 1*; doter, *fear*.
 dogié 115, *delicate*.
 donier 324, *money*.
 donziaz, *n.s.* 165, *young gentleman*.
 donzele 127, etc., *young lady*.
 droit; prendre d. 1275, *exact justice*.
 Eage; mener son e. 187, *lead one's life*.
 encantere, *n.s.* 709, *magician*.
 enerrer 165, *pledge*.
 entres (= entre les) 888.
 escafer 868, *warm*.
 escarcir 359, *become bright, break (of dawn)*.
 estoier 170, *reserve, keep*.
 estoïr 318, 1202, *keep, save*.
 Falir, estre fallans 1064, *not succeed*;
 estre falie, 896, 1160, *become separated, absent*.
 favele 593, *talk, gossip*; torner a f. 139,
become a subject of gossip.
 feu 196, 798, *fief*.
 frecir 867, *become cold*.
 Gaimenter *v.r.* 109, *lament*.
 gemel 1067, *twin*.
 gentior *comp.* 12, 332, *finer, more pleasing*.
 gragnous 578, grainous 734, *sad*.
 Ja + subj. 139, 273, etc., *even though*.
 jube 682, *tunic, undergarment*.
 Laz 576, *mesh, snare*.
 lons *prep.* 539, *according to*.
 Manes 1225, *immediately*.
 mergelhier 321, *defile, pollute*.
 mialtriz 671, miatris 758, *harlot*.
 misel 1110, *wretched*.
 mofon 542, *mitten, glove*.
 movoir la raison 383, *begin the conversation*.
 Noze 165, *brooch*.
 Parentor *gen. pl. used as adj.* 199,
parental.
 pessant; a son p. 647, *displeasing to him*.
 plete 896, *cable, rope*.
 Rencluz 408, *cloistered monk*.
 Segre 669, 673, etc., *father-in-law*.
 sorduient 431, *treacherous*.
 Table 1184, *metal plate, sort of gong*.
 terrous 747, *soiled with mud or dust*.
 Vair; ne v. ne gris 633, *nothing of value*.
 velous 752, *covering for a bed*.
 vene 869, *penance, act of contrition*.
 voilhant *subs.* 648, *waking*.

RAYMOND T. HILL

YALE UNIVERSITY

(To be continued)

NOTES ON FOERSTER'S EDITION OF *IVAIN*

I

DURING a considerable number of years, in reading with students Chrétien's¹ *Ivain*, I have from time to time jotted down notes, mostly on passages where I positively disagreed with opinions of Foerster's or thought it well to suggest a somewhat different view, without necessarily denying that he was right. Sometimes these notes were concerned with other than grammatical questions or questions of interpretation; for instance, with Chrétien's sources or his treatment of his sources. These notes I have now revised for publication, omitting or modifying some, amplifying at times considerably, as in the discussion below on *quelque*, v. 184, and adding some things not previously written out.

From the origin thus indicated of what follows it will be clear that this is not a review, in the ordinary sense of that word, of Foerster's edition of Chrétien's poem. If it were, I should naturally speak in terms of high admiration of his work as an editor. Though I disagree with him in various details and in some matters of wider importance, yet it is hardly necessary to say that without the patient and devoted labor which he gave to the task of editing the works of Chrétien and writing his excellent *Anmerkungen*, these notes of mine would lack their basis, and it may even be said that if they contribute anything of value to the understanding of the poem the credit is in part due to Foerster himself.

As a cursory glance will show, these notes are arranged according to the order of the lines of the poem. It was not intended to indicate misprints that can cause no difficulty to the reader, nor to point out all the cases where one might object to the punctuation. Some things which one might expect to find discussed are here passed over in silence. This does not necessarily signify either

¹ For the poet's name I follow the spelling usual in modern French. The best Old French spelling is *Crestien*, in three syllables, with an *i* followed by the diphthong *ie*, though in such cases the old scribes often wrote only one *i*.

approval or disapproval. Discussions of considerable length or of perhaps more general interest are placed under the most convenient line numbers.

It may well be that one or more articles of importance have been published abroad which, on account of the war, I have not seen.

Except when otherwise indicated, my references are to the fourth small edition of *Ivain*, dated 1912, in the *Romanische Bibliothek*, vol. V.

Vv. 64–68. I think no lacuna need be assumed before v. 67. The text does, to be sure, leave something unsaid, but it is so clearly implied that the expression of it in words is not absolutely necessary. The passage runs essentially thus: She [the queen] came upon them so unnoticeably that before any of them could [look up and] see her she was among them; except that Calogrenant and no one else did [catch sight of her and] rise to his feet, etc. It is superfluous to insert between “among them” and “except” two lines saying “and that no one caught sight of her and all remained seated.” True, Chrétien may well have written two or even more such lines; he is not given to conciseness.—104. The note in the editions of 1906 and 1912 is: *ne doit avoir tancié*] die vollendete Tätigkeit: “hier darf nicht gezankt worden sein” statt des Präsens, das man heute setzen müsste. This assumes *avoir* in two different functions at once: as the impersonal verb, about in the sense of *estre* forming the passive, and also as an auxiliary to express completed action, in which latter case *avoir* is active, not passive, in sense. Büchtemann’s dissertation (dated 1912), which is mentioned by Foerster in his edition of that date in the note on v. 426, has, pp. 50–51, some examples of this well-known impersonal use of (*il*) *a* with a past participle, but he expresses no such opinion of a double function of *avoir*, nor do his examples seem to support Foerster’s view. It would seem that that view ought not to be accepted unless examples can be produced to show it to be correct. It would be necessary to find examples which require the sense of completed action, and to explain away such examples as seem to give clear testimony against that sense. I mention a few examples: *Roman de Thebes*, 5412 (*Et n’i ait ja parlé del joindre*; cf. the immediately following line: *N’i seit ja chevaliers requis*), *Roman de Rou*, ed. Andresen, vol. I, p.

148, vv. 3027-28 (*Mult i vindrent Franceis a cheval e a pié, Asez i out pluré de joie e de pitié*), and vol. I, p. 164, vv. 3481-82 (*Issi furent le jor a cheval e a pié, Que deça ne dela n'i out trait ne lancie²*), in which examples note the tense used in the line preceding or following that which has the impersonal *avoir*; further, *Escoufle*, vv. 3104-05 (*Mout ot au souper poi paroles, Poi envoisié et poi fait noise*), and Froissart, in Paris and Jeanroy, *Extraits des chroniqueurs français*, p. 240 (*La eut grant hustin et dur poigneis, et fait tamainte grant apertise d'armes*); in Luce's ed. vol. VI, p. 124. Cf. also the numerous other cases where *avoir* is impersonal but there is an object with which the past participle agrees or sometimes does not agree; also Tobler's *Vermischte Beiträge*, 3d series, 2d ed. (1908), pp. 28-31, especially the final paragraph, for the explanation of *de* in cases like *il y a eu cent hommes de tués* compared with *il y eut un homme tué*, etc. For Old French may be compared *Aliscans*, ed. Wienbeck, Hartnacke, Rasch, p. 347, v. 8 (*Contre un des lor en avrons .xx. d'armés*, where ms. M reads *armes* instead of *d'armes*). The opinion expressed in Foerster's note was not his at the time of his first edition in 1887; in that edition he had a note on the verse in which he quoted from Tobler the words "man muss den unpers. Gebrauch von *il i a* mit einem Part. Perf. kennen: *i a fait* = lat. *fit*, *i a sauté* = *saltatur*," and himself translated 'hier darf man nicht zanken.' Tobler's remark (printed in 1875) can now be most conveniently found in his *Vermischte Beiträge*, V, p. 400, where there is added a footnote in brackets, one of the "Nachträge des Verfassers in seinem Handexemplare" (see the *Vorwort* to the volume, p. III), which runs thus: NB. Tempor. Bedeutung im Unterschied von der persönlichen Konstruktion. It may be added also that Büchtemann remarks (p. 51) that this impersonal use can occur, with *avoir* = *être*, as making the perfect (or pluperfect) active of an intransitive verb which regularly has *être* for its auxiliary.—175. There is no necessary inconsistency with v. 2089; in the edition of 1887 there did seem to be one.

² I have substituted *j, v*, for Andresen's consonantal *i, u*, and written *ç* for his *c* sibilant before *a*.

II

V. 184.³ The note—wrongly marked as on v. 182—is concerned with the form and meaning of what is in modern French *quelque*, 'some.' In the third edition (1886) of Holland's publication of *Li Romans dou Chevalier au Lyon* (or *Ivain*) there is a short note on v. 182 (184 in Foerster's edition) contributed by Tobler, which reads: *quel que* heisst altfranzösisch immer "welcher auch" und niemals, wie neufranzösisch, "etwelch, enig." And in the *Zs. f. roman. Philol.*, XI (1888), he published, as part of a rather long article, a treatment of the concessive use of *quelque* (pp. 449-50), in which is given an example of *quel que* before the noun (*a quel que painne, se dreça*) with a reference to *Erec* 5206, which as printed was an error⁴ for 3026 in Bekker's edition; it is 3040 in Foerster's edition, and the correct reference to the latter edition appears in the *Vermischte Beiträge*, second series (see pp. 32-34 of the second edition).

Now Foerster for a time accepted Tobler's opinion; see his note on the verse in the large edition of *Ivain* (1887), and *quel que* in the glossary of the small edition of 1906. But in the 1909 edition of *Erec* he defines *quelque* in v. 3040 by *einige*, and in the 1912 edition of *Ivain* he has a remarkable note on v. 184, in which, after giving Tobler's opinion, he says: Aber einmal muss der neufrz. Gebrauch angefangen haben und gerade in Wendungen wie in der vorl.[iegenden] ist es eben zuerst geschehen. Diese Konstruktion war einigen Schreibern noch unbekannt oder auffällig:⁵ . . . [here follow manuscript readings including *grant*, which last he says gives "den richtigen Sinn"] was [i. e., *quelque*] ich denn auch in den Text gesetzt habe und mit 'ziemlich gross, beträchtlich' übersetze. Gerade in dieser Verbindung mit *painne* findet es sich (ausschliesslich?) in den alten Texten, so *Erec* 3040, *Cligés* 6659, *Wilhelm* 2412: *à quelque painne*, und ebenso in den zwei bei Burguy zitierten Stellen *Part.* 5600 [Burguy has correctly 9600] und *Dolop.* S. 265 [p. 319 in the edition I refer to below]. Vgl. it. *qualche*.

³ Vv. 184-5 are: A quelque enui, a quelque painne, Ting cele voie et cel santier.

⁴ The error was repeated in the *Dict. Général* (Hatzfeld, Darmesteter, and Thomas), s.v. *quelque*, and it also appears in Godefroy's *Dict.*, vol. VI, p. 499, col. b.

⁵ This seems to me also very probable.

Now was Tobler right in saying that the meaning was in Old French "whatever" and never "some," or was Foerster right in saying the meaning in the cases in question was "some" or "pretty great," "considerable"? Or was neither quite right though neither was wholly wrong? This is the problem to be solved if possible in what follows. Eminent as Tobler was, especially in syntactical and lexicographical work, he was not infallible, and Foerster's deliberately formed opinion, even though put in this surprising form, is not to be dismissed offhand as erroneous.

In the first place, it should be observed that Foerster afterwards tacitly dropped the meaning *ziemlich gross, beträchtlich*, giving in his *Wörterbuch zu Kristian von Troyes* (or abbreviated as Wb.) in 1914 only the meaning "some" (*einig*) in such phrases as now concern us, as indeed in the glossary in the edition of *Ivain* in 1912.

Secondly, why should any Romance language have used *quelque* (*qualche, calque, qualque*) for "some" when there already existed for that sense *aucun* in Old French, *alcuno* in Italian, etc.? What may be called the rivalry between *aucun* and *quelque* in French seems to be characteristic, not of the early period, the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but of a later period covered by my list below, as seen in the examples containing *quelque* where modern French would use *aucun*.

Thirdly, the first (in time) and the commonest (if not the only) sense of *quel que* or *quelque* in Old French is "whatever," *quel que* being similar in formation to *qui que*, "whoever"; and that sense is still common. From "whatever" to "some," at least with its frequent or usual implication of "not very much," is a change likely to have required a considerable time, and we ought not to admit the new sense until we find some pretty certain instances of it, not merely cases where either meaning makes sense or even good sense, but cases where the meaning must be "some" and cannot be "whatever." It is only natural, moreover, that the different senses of the word should overlap during a certain period of time, and it is not improbable that the meaning now so common developed through some intermediary sense which will make the new meaning easy to understand.

If now we assume for our passage (*Ivain*, 184) the meaning to

be "whatever" it is clear that the knight followed the path with whatever trouble and exertion was necessarily involved. It does not mean "any whatever," but an amount which the poet leaves his readers to imagine; an amount which, if we had the necessary data to determine the value of this unknown quantity, we could express in figures, while "any whatever" would in this case include all imaginable values, any one of which would be quite as correct as any other. He does not say whether it was much or little. The context implies that it was considerable, but there is a difference between saying "considerable" or "great" and leaving scope for the reader's imagination. Obviously the latter course is more suggestive and more effective, and I think it is decidedly better to understand the passage in this way, and not to take *quel que* (or *quelque*) as a colorless "some," which word, indeed, if it suggests anything suggests only a small amount of difficulty. And I think what is true of this passage is true also of all the early passages which contain the phrase *a quelque peine*, and this really is, it seems, the first phrase found that shows the use of *quelque* under discussion. Apparently it is not much, if at all, earlier than Chrétien's time, and if so it is hardly likely that the simple sense "some" should have developed so early as the date of his romances.

Obviously the only way to settle finally our question is to collect a large number of examples ranging from the earliest instances of *quelque* where one familiar with modern French only would naturally take it as meaning "some," to the time when the sense "some" is certain, and the sense "whatever" is either excluded altogether or at least is not an essential part of the meaning in the writer's mind.⁶ This last may not be easy to determine, for "some" (*quelque*), even when naturally used in translation into modern speech, may often really have implied to the writer of earlier times and to his readers the additional idea "whatever (or of whatever sort) it be," and in English this is at times expressed by using "some . . . or other," or by putting a strong emphasis on "some." Thus

⁶ It is not meant to deny that in modern French the word may sometimes imply, more or less clearly, the idea "whatever it may be" in addition to "some" (or "any"), but it seems likely that in Old French that idea was always present. Cf. French *quelconque*, originally formed from *quel que* by adding the temporal adverb meaning "ever," and accordingly at first synonymous with *quelque*.

we get a possible intermediary stage between "whatever" and the simple "some." Further, from "whatever" comes very easily the meaning "any whatever," "any," which covers all imaginable amounts (or kinds), and the meaning, "any" often occurs in my late examples, and *quelque* in modern French can sometimes be rendered by "any" in English.

As is indicated at the end of Foerster's note cited above, the Italian *qualche* must be compared, and I shall give some no less important examples of the Provençal word corresponding and shall say a few words about *cualque*, *qualque* in Spanish. The history of French *quelconque* and *quelqu'un* and of related or similarly formed words in other Romance languages would doubtless repay examination, and I have only incidentally noticed a few instances of these French words. As to *quelqu'un* I will say here only that it seems to be of comparatively late formation, and I think it meant at first "some one, whoever it be" or "any one whatever." My first real or probable instances of *quelque* as "some" without accompanying idea of "whatever" are perhaps found in Commynes, but possibly some earlier examples should be so classed.

I list first a number of Old French texts in which I have found no examples of this peculiar use of *quelque* before a noun. The arrangement is only very roughly chronological. They are:—

Foerster and Koschwitz, *Altfranzösisches Übungsbuch*; *Alexis*, including all the texts printed by Gaston Paris in 1872; Oxford *Roland*; Chançon de Guillelme, ed. Suchier; the latter part of the ms. as printed in 1903; *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* (*Karlsreise*), ed. Koschwitz; *Gormont et Isembart*; Philippe de Thaün, *Comput* and *Bestiaire*; *Reimpredigt*, ed. Suchier (also the text in the *Anhang*); *Couronnement de Louis*, including variants of ms. C and also those printed in *Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français*, 1896, pp. 53 ff., and passages printed by Langlois in the *Appendices* to his edition; Wace, *Brut*, ed. LeRoux de Lincy, and Rou, ed. Andresen; *Li Quatre Livre des Reis*, ed. Curtius; *Les deux rédactions en vers du Moniage Guillaume*, ed. Cloetta (including the *Appendice*); Marie de France, *Lais*, and *Fables*, ed. Warnke; *La Folie Tristan* (mss. of Oxford and Berne), ed. Bédier; Beroul, *Tristan*; Chrétien de Troyes, *Charrette* (for the part not by Chrétien

see the following list), and songs, ed. Foerster; *Philomena*, ed. de Boer; Gautier d'Arras, *Ille et Galeron*, ed. Foerster (for *Eracle* see next list); *Amis et Amiles*, and *Jourdain de Blavies*, 2d ed., K. Hofmann; Bartsch, *Romanzen und Pastourellen*, pp. 1-56 (*Romanzen von Ungenannten*); *Roman des Sept Sages*, ed. Keller, and the text published by Smith in *Romanic Review*, III, 14-67; *Richent*, ed. Lecompte in *Rom. Review*, IV, 271 ff.; *Aucassin et Nicolette*, ed. Suchier; *Roman de la Rose ou de Guillaume de Dole*, ed. Servois; *L'Escoufle*, ed. H. Michelant et P. Meyer; *Lai de l'Ombre*, ed. Bédier, 1913, *Les Narbonnais*, ed. Suchier; *Dit de la Panthère d'Amours*, ed. Todd; *Les Enfances Ogier*, ed. Scheler; *Berte aus grans piés*, ed. Scheler; *Recueil des Fabliaux*, ed. Montaiglon et Raynaud, vol. VI; *Prise amoureuse*, ed. Hoepffner; *Octavian*, ed. Vollmöller.

Besides these I have examined with some care the following works (except those marked with an asterisk, from which I have only examples referred to by others and verified by myself when possible, or found by myself without examination of the whole of the texts) and noted these instances:—

*The Munich *Brut*, ed. Hofmann and Vollmöller, v. 1990 (*Lo gaïant prent a quelque paine*; this example is from Johannssen's dissertation, *Der Ausdruck des Concessivverhältnisses im Altfranz.*; perhaps this and some other references from the same dissertation should really be credited to Tobler); *Thebes*, ed. Constans (all the cases are of *a quelque peine* in varying spellings): 1238, 6241, 6266, 6887, 6889, 7258, 8523, 8767; and in vol. II (verses not in the editor's critical text): p. 16, v. 4496; p. 28, v. 8441; p. 56, v. 197; p. 74, v. 8975; *Eneas*, ed. Salverda de Grave, 4719 (*o quelque peine*); *Troie*, ed. Constans (only *a quelque peine*): 6631, 24950, 29085, and, as a variant, 26180 (in Joly's ed. 26076; this last example from Johannssen); Beneit, **Chronique des ducs de Normandie*, ed. Michel, II, 26488 (*a queu que paine*; this from Godefroy, whose reference is wrongly 26485); Chrétien de Troyes, ed. Foerster (only *a quelque peine*, except one case): *Erec* 3040; *Cligès* 4304, 6659; *Ivain* 184 (*A quelqu' enui, a quelque painne*); *Guillaume d'Angleterre* 2412; *Conte del Graal* (Baist's 2d ed., 1912), 7409. The fragment in *Zs. f. rom. Philol.*, XXXIV, 359-61, has

no example. In the *Charrette*, in the part not by Chrétien, v. 6578, occurs *a quelque painne*; Gautier d'Arras, *Eracle*, ed. Löseth, 3202 (*a quel que paine*); Thomas, *Tristan*, ed. Bédier, 1925 (*a quelque peine*); **Ipomedon*, ed. Kölbing and Koschwitz, 3747 (*a queque* [sic] *peine*); **Partonopeus de Blois*, ed. Crapelet, 9600 (*a quel que paine*); *Chastoiement d' un père à son fils* (1824 ed.), p. 138, v. 42 (*a quelque paine*); *Guillaume de Palerne*, ed. Michelant, 4545 (*a quelque paine*); *Atre perillos*, *Archiv f. neuere Sprachen*, XLII: 404, 445, 1108, 1361, 1899 (only *a quelque paine*); *Dolopathos*, ed. Brunet and Montaiglon, p. 319 (*a quelke painne*); **Ider*, ed. Gelzer: 2963 (*de quel[que] viande*; see the editor's note), 4253 (*a quelque peine*); **Horn*, ed. Brede and Stengel (*Ausg. u. Abhh.*, VIII, 4886, *aque ke dolur*. Johannssen, from whom I get this case, refers to Michel's ed. and prints *a queke* (l. *quelke*) *dolur*. The correction is probable); **Guillaume le Maréchal*, ed. P. Meyer, 8997 (*a quelque peine*; passage in *Romania*, XI, 64, cited in Godefroy); **Chevalier as deus espées*, ed. Foerster: 659, 9555, 9563 (all *a quelque paine*; these from Johannssen); **Guillaume de Tyr et ses continuateurs*, ed. P. Paris (references to book, chapter, and line; all cases from Johannssen): ii, 20, 19 (*a quelque peines*); iv, 14, 14 (*en quelque maniere*); x, 25, 41 (*a queuque peine*); xvi, 4, 36 (*avoit quelque mescheance*); xvii, 12, 13 (*de quelque part*); xviii, 3, 27 (*en quelque maniere*); xxi, 17, 11 (*de quelque terre*); xxii, 26, 8 (*a quelque chief*); *Godefroy has *En queque maniere* (vol. VI, p. 499, top of column *b*, dated 1261; but this example perhaps belongs with those which I give below for the construction numbered (3), as it is placed among those with a following verb, though nothing more is quoted); *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Méon (my references are to volume and page, Méon's numbering being often incorrect; all my examples except one are from the second part. In any case these references are subject to correction when the new edition by Langlois is completed): I, 158 (*Trueve a chascune quelque herne*); II, 62 (*de quelque maniere*); II, 68 (*par quixque malaventures*); II, 146 (*a quelque paine*); II, 312 (*quelque chose avoir*); II, 353 (*quelque chevalerie emprendre*); II, 458 (*fera quelque chevissance*); III, 18 (*en quelque chambre*); III, 112 (*a fait . . . quelque chose*); III, 112 (two lines

farther, faire *Quelque murdre ou quelque contraire*); III, 137 (*par quelque peril emprendre*); III, 218 (*en quelque saison*); III, 277 (*quelque partie*); *Burguy, *Grammaire de la langue d'oïl*, I, 188 has "*Par quauque cause ou raison* (1301, Hist. de la Rochelle p. Arcère)"; this I have not verified; Froissart, *Meliador*, ed. Longnon: 16875 (*euist quelque cose dit*); 23956 (*seront quelque* [sic] *aventures*); *Les Cent Ballades*, ed. Raynaud: no. xxx, 2 (*En quelque plaisant assemblée*); lxxiii, 10 (*par quelque endroit*); lxxviii, 27 (*par quelque endroit*); Deschamps, **Oeuvres Complètes*, vols. VII, VIII, ed. Raynaud: VII, p. 87, v. 5 (*quelque part*); 162, v. 212 (*acorder quelque querelle*); 163, v. 271 (*Quelque part furent enterrez*); 164, v. 288 (*A quelque gieu*); 354, v. 222 (*par quelque voie oblique*); VIII, p. 42, v. 169 (*quelque part*); 299, v. 1699 (*quelque saison*); 329, v. 2669 (*par quelque voie*); 340, v. 33 (*quelque friture ne donnez*); Gerson, **Ad deum vadit*, ed. Carnahan (*Univ. of Ill. Studies in Lang. and Lit.*, vol. III, no. 1), line 2890 (*sans avoir fiance en quelque autre aide*); **Miracles de Nostre Dame*, ed. G. Paris and U. Robert (examples from vol. II only): p. 22, v. 492 (*Par quelque voie*; after negative); 134, v. 317 (*En quelque lieu*); **Mistère du Viel Testament*, ed. James de Rothschild (vol. I only. From here on I quote rather more fully as the modern use might be expected to show itself sometimes unmistakably): v. 1253 (*nous* [Adam and Eve] *en irons musser En quelque lieu*); 1717 (*N'a il* [Dieu] *de nous quelque memoire?*); 1733 (*Tous nudz, sans quelque couverture*); 2155 (*Moyen d'avoir quelque advantage*); 2202 (*il nous est necessaire De quelque habitation faire*); 2848 (*jugement . . . Ou il n' y a quelque merci*); 2881 (*Dampné suis, sans quelque doubtance*); 2917 (*Il y a quelque adversité*); 2997 (*Je ne sauroye En quelque voye Fors dire*); 3100 (*Et adviser en quelque lieu Ou nous et les nostres seron*; but this apparently is a case where *en quelque . . . ou*, etc., means "in whatever place we . . . shall be"); 3110 (*Quelque place l'en trouvera*); 3646 (*sans quelque deffault*); 4391 (*que la beste . . . Ne sortisse . . . Par quelque grant fain de menger*); 4527 (*Gardon nous bien, [comma sic] en quelque place* [no comma in printed text] *Qu'il ne nous puisse ravaller*); 4594 (*Se quelcun n' ay a me mener. Observe quelcun*); 4614 (*Vostre prison* [i. e., hell] *est elle si tresforte Qu'il n'en faille*

aucunement, ne sorte, [whole line sic] *Quelque Dyable*); 4663 (*Peult estre que tu trouveras Quelque beste en quelque haillier*); 4724 (*Je cuide qu'en ce boys Il y a quelque sauvagine*); 4772 (*C'est quelque ung que j'ay atouché. Observe quelque ung*); 4867 (*S'il ne se est caché tenu En quelque lieu a l'escart*); 5082 (*sans avoir quelque merci*); 5182 (*S'il a . . . pensé Quelque chose qui me [? ne] soit bonne*); 5491 (*Sans excepter quelque personne*); 5515 (*de vices sont si comblez Qu'ilz ne pensent a quelque bien*), and many other examples; see 5625, 5779, 5853, 5891, 5903, 5991, 6027, 6132, 6228, 6317-9, between 6373 and 6374, 6456, 6520 (*quelqun*), etc. I have noted about twenty-five more cases, among them a plural *quelques* (v. 7436); *Mystère de Saint Bernard de Menthon*, ed. Lecoy de la Marche: v. 568 (*Il vous fault donné quesque [sic] estrainne*); 707 (*Mieulx amera en devocion Estre en quelque religion Que au monde*); 729 (*Que ne suy ge bien grant seigneur, Abbé ou quelques [sic] grant prelas!*); 1247 (*Donne nous quelque alegement*); 1647 (*Avec quéque belle filiete*); 2490 (*Qu'il [Dieu] nous envoie quelque signe*); 4054 (*Pour quelque grace [en] impetrer*); **Pathelin*, ed. Schneegans in *Bibliotheca Romanica*, v. 1188 (*Se je dy huy aultre parolle A vous n'a quelque aultre personne*); Commynes, **Mémoires*, ed. Mandrot (my references are to pages in vol. I): p. 26 (*dist alors à quelq'un de ses privez*; in Littré, s. v. *quelqu'un*); 34 (*Au charroy se ralierent quelzques [sic] gens de pied bourguignons*); 207 (*quelzques sept ou huyt cens personnes*; from Brunot, *Hist. de la langue française*, I, p. 432), and Littré has two other examples from Commynes for this use with a numeral⁷); Bonivard, *"*Adv. et dev. des leng.*, p. 58, Fick" (*Si quelc'un demande l'experience*. This example is given in Godefroy, X, 457, s. v. *quelqu'un*, but I have not yet been able to verify it).

Finally, I add some examples from **Pierre Gringore* (ed. Ch. d'Héricault and A. de Montaiglon), referring to volume and page. These are intended to show that though the simple sense "some" had developed by the end of the fifteenth century, yet for some time longer, at least with some writers, the idea of "whatever (or whoever) it be" was sufficiently preserved to be plain to the reader.

⁷ This use is English and German also. But in English it is found much earlier than in French.

This sense is particularly appropriate after a negative or after the preposition *sans*. Thus, in vol. I, p. 29 (*sans quelque difference*); p. 87 (*Veu qu'il deffend en leur maison attraire Quelque femme*); p. 171 (after a negative); p. 207 (*Se on fait au Prince quelque tort*); II, p. 90 (*Ilz n'auront force ne vigueur Pour me faire quelque falace*); p. 192 (*sans argent prendre De nully en quelque maniere*); p. 260 (after negative); so too pp. 270, 275. In these cases the secondary or intermediate sense of "any whatever," "any" is clear.

It appears, then, that the first meaning of *quelque* in *a quelque peine* was "whatever," especially in an individual case (with whatever difficulty was involved in that particular case). The next stage was either (1) "some," with the accessory sense "of whatever sort," "some . . . no matter what," "some . . . or other"; whence, as this accessory idea became less and less important, the simple sense "some," even very commonly implying a rather small quantity or number; or (2) "any whatever," "any"; cf. *aucun*, and also *quelconque*, which latter word was originally synonymous or practically so with *quelque*, but has not kept pace with *quelque*, having stopped with this secondary sense ("any whatever"). In modern use it differs also in position, always following its noun.

Thus far we have considered only French. It remains to glance at the state of things in other Romance languages; and as Foerster has mentioned the Italian *qualche* we may take that first. Besides the dictionaries one naturally turns for old examples to the concordances prepared for the Dante Society and to Professor McKenzie's concordance to Petrarch. It may be well to say first that the original sense is, as in French, "whatever." This appears from its origin, parallel to that of the French word, and from its use in Dante, as in *Purg.*, xiv, 69 (*Da qual che [or qualche, as it has also been printed] parte il periglio lo assanni*), and *Canz.* xvii, 3 (*in qual parte ch'io sia*), examples, it is true, not readily found under *qualche* or *quale* in the concordances just mentioned. Fay's concordance, however, gives under *qualche* the important passage *Inf.*, xiii, 29 (*Se tu tronchi Qualche frascchetta d'una d'este piante*), showing the use with a noun without a following verb, and a similar case is found in Dante's prose, *Conv.* iii, 12, line 65 (Moore's edition of Dante's

works), which runs: *ma conviene per qualche accidente essere nel processo*, etc. In the former of these two passages it seems plain that *qualche* means "any whatever," and in the latter "some . . . whatever it be" is quite satisfactory. If any doubt be felt as to the meaning in Dante, that doubt will perhaps be removed on consulting the concordance to Petrarch and observing how well one or the other of these meanings fits the context, and how necessary "whatever" is in *Son. ccxxii* (*In qual ch'etade, in quai che strani lidi*).

Noteworthy in Italian is the use of *qualche* with a singular noun when the sense is plural. How easily the plural sense may develop from the idea "whatever" or "any" is apparent on comparison with such English sentences as "tell it to whatever person asks about it."

Further, one may compare *qualcuno* (found in Petrarch a few times, but not in Dante), the history of which is apparently similar to that of French *quelqu'un*, also *un qualche*, and *qualunque* (cf. French *quelconque*, and Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Gramm.*, III, § 630).

For Provençal, which Foerster did not mention in the note quoted above, the situation may be expected to be much the same as in Old French and in Italian of the mediæval period. The following examples clearly indicate that such is the case.

First may be mentioned, with or without quotation, a few passages in the *Evangile de Saint Jean* found in Bartsch-Koschwitz, *Chrestomathie Provençale* (1903-04): chap. xiv, v. 13 (*calque chausa requerret*; xv, 7 and 16; xvi, 13 (*calque chausa aurira*); which show that the original sense is "whatever"; cf. also below, on the construction numbered (3). Next, from the same *Chrestomathie*: col. 48, v. 33 (*parlatz ab la reina per qualque gis*; *Girart de Rossilho*); 112, 20 (*qu'en calque solatz m'esgausis*; *Guiraut de Borneil*); 113, 6 (*Sofraignera il cals que disnars*; id.); 195, 31 (*o d'autra calque pel moleta*; *Daude de Pradas*); 242, 22 (*c'ades calque drut hom no-ill devi*; *Raimon Vidal*); 311, 30 (*Si de calqu'estrumen Sab un pauc de prezen*; *Guiraut Riquier*); 312, 11 (*Car per homes senatz, Sertz de calque saber*; id.); 444, 17 (*si vos aves confort De qualque un que sia plus fort*; *Ludus Sancti Jacobi*); Appel's *Provençalische Chrestomathie*, 4th ed., 1912: p. 25, v. 99

(*o feira parer c'ostes fil | o calque ren davan sos oïls; Flamenca*,⁸ v. 2426 in P. Meyer's second edition); 55, 10 (*qui d'amor non sen | al cor qualque doussa sabor; Bernart de Ventadorn*); 103, 9 (*qu'a la iove [= jove] dizia | suau calque solatz; Guiraut Riquier*); 166, 10 (*o quals que mala creatura | no t'aucizia; Diätetik, from Suchier's Denkmäler prov. Lit. u. Spr.*); 178, 65 (*que us donara calque repaus; Bartsch, Denkmäler der prov. Lit.*)⁹; *Altprovenzalische Marienklage*, ed. Mushacke in Foerster's *Romanische Bibliothek*, no. III): v. 263 (*qui nol gites Desobre brac o calc'ordura*); 708 (*Aias de mi calque merce*); *Flamenca*, ed. P. Meyer; my references are to his second edition. I have five examples of our word, besides the one given above from Appel's *Chrestomathie*. Of these, two were furnished me from Meyer's first edition by Mr. C. E. Kany, a student in the Harvard Graduate School (vv. 2682 and 3013). The cases are these: v. 2168 (*Que desir e falsas esperas E pensar . . . Adus calc'umbra de plazer*); 2682 (*Guillem[s] s'en intr'a qualque pena*); 2748 (*Que non n'agues calque merce*); 3013 (*Et autre mal an quelques ora[s] De repausar, tart o abora[s]*); 5783 (*De la tor eis a calque pena*¹⁰); N'At de Mons, *Werke*, ed. Bernhardt in Foerster's *Altfranzösische Bibliothek*, vol. XI (cf. the editor's notes and Appel in *Zs. f. roman. Philol.*, XI, 559 ff., also *Revue des langues romanes*, XXXI, 448 ff.): no. i, v. 197 (*Sobre calque faisso Moven o non moven*); 206 (*Totas res . . . An frejor . . . O calque esser ver*); 356 (*Creirem calque fador*); 851 (*Saber de calque re*); 1510 (*co-l focx ardens Par arden calque re*); 1677 (*calsque accidens Mals*); 1722-24 (*faisso fa Calsque cauza fazens. Faissos es fazemens De calque fazedor*); 1750-59 and 2029 [see as above]; ii, 70 (*per calque razo Bona*); 138 (*que calque vetz No-l membre*); and see the following places: iii, 43, 203; iv, 149, 257, 258; v, 40, 266, 284.

See also Raynouard, *Lexique Roman*, V, 2, s. v. *qualque*, and Levy, *Prov. Supplement-Wörterbuch*, s. v. *calque*, noticing also *calque un*, *calquedun*, and *un calque*.

⁸ For other examples from this poem see below in this list.

⁹ Appel's glossary gives "*welch immer, irgend welch, ingend ein*" as the meaning for three of these cases, and "*etwelch*" for the other two.

¹⁰ Meyer's glossary explains *a calque pena* in lines 2682 and 5783 by "*avec un peu de peine, non sans peine.*"

Provençal and Italian are not the only languages to be considered in a study of the history of French *quelque*. Though the Spanish *cualque* in the sense of *alguno* has disappeared from the literary language now, it existed in the classical period and Old Spanish also had the word. It is not necessary for me to collect examples; that has been done with sufficient fulness, as I believe, to show that the sense development was parallel to that in the three languages already examined. I refer to Cuervo's article on *cualque* in his *Diccionario de construcción y régimen*, for his examples point pretty clearly to the original sense as "whatever," though he does not say so. He remarks that in this use *cualque* "no se empleaba sino en singular" (cf. Italian *qualche*), but he finds one instance of a plural *cualesque* which, however, he considers doubtful. He also mentions an obsolete Catalan *qualque* in his remarks on the etymology of the word.

In what precedes we have not considered the immediate origin of this remarkable use of *quelque* with a noun. Tobler has done so (*Verm. Beitr.*, II², p. 32); starting from cases like [1] *quel ore que jel voldrai prandre*, he says: sie [die Sprache] hatte dann in verkürzten, das Verbum unausgesprochen lassenden Sätzen das *que* merkwürdiger Weise gleich hinter *quel* und vor das Substantivum gestellt: [2] *a quelque painne, se dreça*, Erec 3040; sie hatte, nachdem eine gewisse Gewöhnung an das unmittelbare Nebeneinander von *quel* und *que* eingetreten war, an ihm missbräuchlich auch da festgehalten, wo der konzessive Ausdruck sein besonderes Verbum besass: [3] *quiex que meffaiz Cil las de chevaliers ait faiz* . . . ja sojar da, wo *que* an der gebührenden Stelle sich bereits befand: [4] *Quels que pecieres que tu soies*, etc. For convenience of reference I have inserted in brackets numbers indicating the order in time of these four constructions as Tobler apparently took it. Now the question may arise whether it is not better to derive (3) from (1) directly, and (2) from (3), thus taking only one step at a time, instead of two at once (dropping out the verb and putting the *que* between *quel* and the noun), while we admit that (4) is a combination of (1) and (3), as he seems to do. Then we might say that putting *quel* + *que* + noun instead of *quel* + noun + *que* is readily intelligible, since "whatever" is felt as a single idea, and so *que*

is made to follow *quel* immediately, just as *que* immediately follows *qui* to express with it "whoever" (*quicunque*). This *qui que*, it may be observed, is old, occurring in the *Roland*, v. 1279. Similarly English can say *whatsoever* (or *whatever*) *man*, and also *what man soever*. Then omission of the verb, at least when the verb is *estre*, is easy, the sense being still clear, and that gives (2). See also below.

It seems desirable to consider the relative ages of (1), (2), (3), and (4), as actually found in Old French. Of them all (1) is doubtless the oldest; it occurs, for instance, in Foerster and Koschwitz, *Altfranz. Uebungsbuch* (1915), col. 167, line 80 of the *Paraphrase des hohen Liedes* (cf. the note, coll. 315-16), and neither (3) nor (4) seems to occur in Chrétien de Troyes,¹¹ though the latter is common enough in Old French, occurring earlier than Chrétien's poems, and is the form recognized in modern French. My earliest examples of (4) are in the Anglo-French *Brandan*, ed. Suchier in Boehmer's *Roman. Studien*, I, 583 ff., vv. 360, 976, 992; they are mentioned by Johannssen. It therefore occurs earlier than (3) as far as my material shows, for (3) I have not found before *Troie* (vv. 4448, 21892), and Wace's *Rou* (ed. Andresen, vol. I, p. 118, v. 2193, and vol. II, p. 255, v. 5628). But this is indecisive; the construction (4) may well have been at first a vulgarism, and one appearing first in England, and earlier examples of (3) may well have existed. Indeed, since it is difficult not to suppose that (4) presupposes (3), it may even be urged that these three cases of (4) are really evidence pointing to a very early date for (3).

For (2) my earliest instances are from the Munich *Brut* and from *Thebes*, but, as we have just seen, (3) may be decidedly earlier, so that the derivation of (2) from (3) is not so improbable as the first appearances of (2), (3), and (4) would indicate. I may add that I did not begin to note instances of (3) until I had already collected most of the examples of (2) listed above. Besides those which had been previously noticed (see Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.*, II², 33; Johannssen's dissertation; Brunot, *Hist. de la langue franç.*, I, 340; Burguy, *Gramm.*, I, 188; Godefroy, *Dict.*, VI, 499, 500),

¹¹ (4) is not entirely lacking in the manuscripts, and Foerster's large ed. of *Ivain* and the first small ed. of the same showed it in v. 5803.

and the two passages from Wace, *Rou*, mentioned a few lines above, I have observed only *A quelque chief m'en covient traire* (p. 67, v. 114 of the *Chastoiment d'un père à son fils*, ed. of 1824), and *En quelque estat ilz soient* (Gerson, *Ad deum vadit*, ed. Carnahan, line 2428). Some additional evidence for (3) can be drawn from Provençal and Italian; see, for instance, passages in the *Evangile de Saint Jean* like those noticed above, p. 245; N'At de Mons, i, v. 1742 (cf. the editor's note), ii, 224; Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Gramm.*, III, § 630; and, for Italian, Dante, *Purg.*, xiv, 69.

An addition, partly, I think, due to Professor Grandgent, should be made to the explanation suggested above of putting *que* immediately after *quel*, as in (2), (3), and (4). There are passages in Old French where *quelque* (*quel que*) means "whichever one," "whatever thing"; that is, where no noun is expressed, though one (or more) may be found in the context. I note the following cases, among them some where *quel* is preceded by the definite article: *Roland*, 593 (*De quel que seit*, "from whichever one," i. e., *bataille*); *Eneas*, 7759 (*Li quels que seit, morir estuet*); *Li Quatre Livre des Reis*, ed. Curtius, p. 107, v. 12 (*si li di que il eslised de treis choses quele que il volt mielz que jó li face*); *Aliscans*, ed. Wienbeck, Hartnacke, Rasch, v. 3167 (*Auquel ke soit la ferai comparer*); Gautier d'Arras, *Eracle*, v. 5732 (*Al quel que soit l'estuet couster*); *Rigomer*, ed. Foerster, v. 5393 (*Ja ne faurés au quelque [sic] soit*); *Dolopathos*, p. 388 (*k'il li die Quels k' (rather ke) il est et de quel[le] [sic; rather quel] vie*); *Renart*, ed. Martin, branch xix, vv. 31-34 (*Assez vos donroie a mangier De quel que auriez plus chier, Ou bon froment, ou bone avaine, Ou bone orge*, etc.); and branch xxiv, vv. 67-70 (*Toutes les foiz c'Adens [i. e., Adam] feri En la mer, que beste en issi, Cele beste s'i retenoient, Quel que iert, si l'aprivoisoient*).

I see no reason why both causes could not have contributed to the development of a *quelque peine* and similar phrases.

E. S. SHELDON

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

(To be continued)

THE DAWN OF ITALIAN CULTURE IN AMERICA

"By every language you learn, a new world is opened before you. It is like being born again; and new ideas break upon the mind with all the freshness and delight with which we may suppose the first dawn of intellect to be accompanied."

ITALY, the mother country of many famous explorers and navigators, was destined to derive no material advantages from the discoveries of her illustrious sons. While Spain, France and England acquired most of their American possessions through the successful voyages of Columbus, Cabot and Verrazani, Italy never gained an inch of territory nor planted a single colony on this continent. Before the middle of the 19th century scarcely any Italians emigrated to the United States.¹ Yet, in spite of this utter lack of Italian conquest, colonization and emigration, Italian culture began to penetrate into this country at an early date and exercised a marked influence upon the leading American writers. The English classics, which formed an essential part of the private library of every educated man, served no doubt to create an interest in the land of Dante and Michael Angelo. The frequent references to Italy which many of them contain could not pass unobserved by the careful reader. They stirred his imagination and aroused in him a feeling of inquisitiveness which needed to be satisfied: the rest followed as a matter of course.

Students of Latin were naturally led to an acquaintance with Italy because of the important historical characters and events with which she is closely connected. Many of those who looked to that country for ancient monuments discovered that the modern authors also were no less fascinating, and therefore did not fail to give them

¹ "From the earliest days of the colonization of North America up to less than a generation ago, the influx from Italy was barely a trickle, so inconsiderable that a microscope is almost needed to distinguish the Italian resident population in 1850." Eliot Lord, special agent for the U. S. Tenth Census, in *The Italian in America*, p. 2.

their immediate attention. Benjamin Franklin, who began to study Italian in 1733, was one of the first American scholars to understand and duly appreciate its value, and earnestly suggested that together with French it be given precedence over Latin in the school curriculum. "I would offer it to the consideration of those who superintend the education of our youth," he wrote, "whether (since many of those who begin with Latin quit the same after spending some years without having made any great proficiency, and what they have learned becomes almost useless, so that their time has been lost) it would not have been better to have begun with the French, proceeding to the Italian and Latin. For though after spending the same time they should quit the study of languages and never arrive at the Latin, they would however have acquired another tongue or two, that, being in modern use, might be serviceable to them in modern life."²

In 1760 Thomas Jefferson turned to Italian literature and gradually made himself familiar with many of its masterpieces. He read but little of Dante—probably because of his unfamiliarity with old Italian forms and constructions—and had no great admiration for Petrarch because of the monotony of the poet's constant praise and complaints of Laura, but he enjoyed the epic poems of Tasso and the poetry of Metastasio; he loved the minor Italian poets, and copies of some of their poetic compositions in his own handwriting are still extant. Thanks to his initiative, in 1779 Italian was introduced into William and Mary College, whence it gradually passed to other American institutions of learning.³

Early in the eighteenth century a number of Italian classics had already reached this continent either in their original form or in translations. Boyd's⁴ and Carey's⁵ *Divine Comedy*, Fairfax's⁶ *Jerusalem Delivered* and Rose's⁷ *Orlando Innamorato* and *Orlando*

² *The complete Works of B. Franklin*, compiled and edited by John Bigelow, vol. I, p. 97. Putnam's Sons, 1887.

³ The instructor in charge was Charles Bellini, a member of the party of Philip Mazzei, who came to this country in 1773 to attempt the cultivation of the vine, the olive, and other fruits of Italy.

⁴ London, 1802.

⁵ London, 1822.

⁶ London, 1600.

⁷ London, 1823. (Reviewed in *North American Review*, 1824, vol. 19.)

Furioso were among the first to find their way to America. Though comparatively few copies were available during the whole of that century and part of the next, it is interesting to note that Charles Brockden Brown, the first American to make a profession of Literature, introduced Italian characters in his *Osmond* (1799)⁸ and *Arthur Merwyn* (1800),⁹ and that by 1826 Richard Alsop, poet and wit, had already published his *Enchanted Lake of the Fairy Morgana*¹⁰ from the *Orlando Innamorato* of Francesco Berni.

As far back as 1799 articles on the most distinguished writers of Italy began to appear in several American Magazines and Reviews with appropriate passages from their works in Italian, or English, or in both. American reprints of articles of the same nature were also widely circulated. "As the protection of English copyright did not extend to America all of them were reprinted here, and since the publisher had nothing to pay for contributions or articles—the heaviest item in the European cost—they were reprinted, at the mere charge of printing and paper and thus secured a very extensive sale."^{12, 13} It was mainly in this manner that the average American reader gained a general insight into the social, political, and intellectual life of the Italian people. In some cases this gave rise to a special interest in Italian letters, and persons so inclined eagerly turned to the poetic masterpieces of Italy in English translations. But, as we have already said, these were few in number, and on the whole very unsatisfactory, for, as William Tudor remarked in the first number of the *North American Review* (1815), "the sublimity of the Italian poets very often can not be translated, because it is connected with the charm of the language,

⁸ Chapter I.

⁹ Book I, Chapter 6.

¹⁰ Published by Isaac Riley Co., New York, 1806.

¹² J. S. Buckingham, in *America*, New York, 1841, pp. 144-145.

¹³ An interesting example of this is the *Select Journal of Foreign Periodical Literature*, published in 1833 by Andrews Norton and Charles Folsom. "The design of this work," stated by the editors in their preliminary remarks to the first volume, "is to give a selection of the most interesting articles and the most important information contained in the principal foreign literary journals, a design, which it is hoped, may contribute to promote the literature of our country, even if but imperfectly executed."

which gives it a grace and force unknown to the other languages of Europe." It became therefore imperative for such as desired to get a clear understanding of Italian literary works to study the idiom in which they were written. Hence, the more conscientious students did not fail to do so, being further encouraged by the comparative ease with which that language could be mastered. "Italian is simple in its structure and principles of pronunciation, and is more easily acquired, probably, than any other language," wrote Jared Sparks, the American biographer and historian. "Since the task is so easy, and the treasure to reward the student so rich and abundant, it is certainly a little remarkable that the tide of fashionable study has not long ago turned in this direction."¹⁴

One of the best guides in the English language for the American student to an acquaintance with the literature of Italy was Roscoe's translation of Sismondi de' Sismondi's *Historical View of the Literatures of Southern Europe* which was reprinted in this country in 1827.¹⁵ The elaborate *Biographies of the Medici* were also of importance in this connection; for, on the publication of those elegant and popular works, a fund of interesting, new and valuable information was communicated on the subject of Italy, considered in its literary relations, of which there existed before only vague and uncertain notions. "We have in them a comprehensive and lucid view of the most enlightened period of Italian history. We are made acquainted with the characters and literary merits of the best authors of the time and are told what they accomplished and how they ought to be estimated."¹⁶

Books of travel, which were next in frequency to the Bible and religious tracts, contributed also to a great extent to disseminate among the American people a knowledge of Italy and her inhabitants. At first these were merely reproductions of books published in England, especially Eustace's *Tour through Italy*,¹⁷ Goethe's *Italian Journey*, and Madame de Staël's *Corinne*. Before the first decade of the nineteenth century American books of travel were

¹⁴ *North American Review*, 1817.

¹⁵ J. J. Harper, New York, 1827.

¹⁶ J. Sparks in the *North American Review*, 1827.

¹⁷ M. Carey, Philadelphia, 1815.

extremely scarce, this being due to the fact that the young men of this country were constantly dissuaded from visiting Europe because of the exaggerated ideas then prevalent concerning the facilities for vice existing abroad. Deprivation of morals and diminution of patriotism were looked upon as the inevitable consequences of any journey to the Old World. Even persons of higher intelligence and superior intellect entertained this view. "Let us view the disadvantages of sending a youth to Europe," writes Thomas Jefferson in 1785 to a young Virginia friend, J. Bannister, Jr. "To enumerate them all it would require a volume. I will select a few. If he goes to England, he learns drinking, horse-racing, and boxing. These are the peculiarities of English education. The following circumstances are common to education in that and other countries of Europe. He acquires a fondness for European luxury and dissipation, and a contempt for the simplicity of his own country; he is fascinated with the privileges of the European aristocrats, and sees with abhorrence the lovely equality which the poor enjoy with the rich in his own country: he contracts a partiality for aristocracy or monarchy; he forms foreign friendships which will never be useful to him, and loses the season of life for forming, in his country, those friendships which, of all others, are the most faithful and permanent; he is led by the strongest of all the human passions into a spirit for female intrigue, destructive of his own and others' happiness: he recollects the voluptuary dress and arts of European women, and pities and despises the chaste affections and simplicity of those of his own country: he retains through life a fond recollection and a hankering after those places which were the scenes of his first pleasures and of his first connections; he returns to his own country a foreigner, unacquainted with the practices of domestic economy necessary to preserve him from ruin, speaking and writing his native tongue as a foreigner, and therefore unqualified to obtain those distinctions which eloquence of the pen and tongue ensures in a free country; for I would observe to you, that what is called style in writing and speaking is formed early in life, while the imagination is warm and impressions are permanent. It appears to me, then, that an American coming to Europe for education loses in his knowledge, in his morals, in his health, in his habits, and in his

happiness. The consequences of a foreign education are alarming to me as an American."¹⁸

Fortunately, these objections to travel came to be generally disregarded;¹⁹ people gradually began to realize that travelling was one of the best means for enlarging one's sphere of observation and reflection, and that there was much to be gained by one's experiences abroad. Moreover, as this country, still in its infancy, suffered from literary poverty,²⁰ zealous scholars naturally looked to the Old World for broader culture and more thorough training.²¹ So that, in time, a trip to Europe became a very common thing among American students, and the grand tour, so called, through England, France, and Italy was finally considered the indispensable final polish to education. In 1899 William Tudor wrote as follows:

"The people of this town (Boston) are great travellers. It would be difficult to find a society of half a dozen who change their linen every day, in which some, if not most of the party, have not visited Europe. Commercial pursuits have led a great many; almost everybody has been to England. The natural desire, in liberal and intelligent minds, of seeing Europe, of which from their infancy they have heard so much, inspired a restless, enlightened curiosity, to visit regions so famous. Nor is this confined to men alone, but both sexes have enjoyed the advantage of travelling in an unusual degree. You might find a large circle of both sexes who have not

¹⁸ *Life of Thomas Jefferson* by H. S. Randell, vol. I, p. 434.

¹⁹ Their influence, however, was still felt far into the first half of the nineteenth century; for even in 1826 we read of Longfellow's mother writing to her son who is about to leave for Havre: "May you hold fast your integrity and retain that purity of heart which is so endearing to your friends. I feel as if you were going into a thousand perils." (*Life*, vol. I, p. 72.) Again, eleven years later, we hear of Charles Sumner saying before setting out for Europe: "There will be many who will be willing to cry out during my absence: 'Europe will spoil him.'" (*Works of Charles Sumner*, Lee and Shephard, Boston, 1875, vol. I, p. 206.)

²⁰ "When I wanted to study German," wrote George Ticknor, "I was obliged to seek a text-book in one place, a dictionary in a second, and a grammar in a third, the last two different in their kind. If I wanted to be a scholar, I had to go where the best instruction was to be had, to Europe, and first of all to Germany." (*Life of G. Ticknor*, vol. I, p. 25.)

²¹ In 1805 Washington Irving writes to his brother William that in Paris the doors of knowledge are thrown open and that the different pursuits, both useful and ornamental, could be prosecuted. *Life and Letters of W. Irving*, by his nephew, Pierre M. Irving, vol. I, p. 141.

only seen London and Paris but Rome and Naples. If no other good is produced the subjects of conversation in society are thus rendered more amusing and instructive."²²

Among the most notable Americans who visited Europe before the second half of the nineteenth century were the following:

Benjamin Franklin—1725,	Henry Ware, Jr.—1830,
Bishop John Carroll—1770,	Orville Dewey—1833,
Thomas Jefferson—1785,	R. W. Emerson—1833,
Washington Irving—1804,	Theodore Fay—1833,
Washington Allston—1804,	Henry T. Tuckerman—1833,
Theodore Lyman—1814,	Wm. C. Bryant—1834,
William Prescott—1815,	R. H. Wilde—1835,
James Sloan—1816,	T. W. Parsons—1836,
George Ticknor—1817,	Charles Sumner—1836,
Edward Everett—1817,	Catherine Sedgwick—1839,
Hugh S. Legaré—1818,	Francis Bowen—1840,
George Bancroft—1818,	George Calvert—1841,
Fitzgreen Halleck—1822,	J. T. Hadley—1842,
Samuel Goodrich—1823,	Bayard Taylor—1844,
Alexander E. Everett—1824,	G. B. Cheever—1844,
S. L. Fairfield—1824,	J. D. Huntington—1845,
N. W. Carter—1825,	Margaret Fuller—1846,
G. S. Greene—1827,	G. W. Curtis—1846,
J. F. Cooper—1828,	Wm. A. Butler—1846,
E. D. Griffin—1828,	J. T. Fields—1847,
H. W. Longfellow—1829,	Wm. W. Story—1848,
Thomas Ward—1829,	T. B. Read—1850,
N. P. Willis—1830,	Mrs. E. C. Kinney—1850.
Walter Cotton—1830,	

While abroad the majority of those above mentioned did not fail to go to Italy, for Italy was then, as it has always been, an ideal resort for tourists. Lovers of art were attracted to that country by the numerous artistic productions which have been the admiration of successive generations; others, who suffered from poor health, sought to recuperate in her delightful climate, under her

²² *Letters on Eastern States*, p. 375.

blue and sunny sky. Several, in the course of their wanderings, jotted down their first impressions of the various places they had visited, and on their return to America gathered them together and gave them to the press for publication. Among these writers of books of travel, James Sloan deserves special mention, for in his *Rambles in Italy during the year 1816-1817* he not only describes the country and her people, but lays also a great deal of emphasis on the Italian language and literature, using Italian phrases and quoting from the Italian writers with whom he had become acquainted.²³

In like manner, Henry Theodore Tuckerman, in his *Italian Sketch Book*²⁴ gives us a series of Essays illustrative of the local and social features of that country with the explicit purpose "of awakening in the minds of the readers an interest and faith in humanity as there existent."²⁵ Rome, Florence, Naples, Venice are faithfully described; church ceremonies, religious processions, popular superstitions and various phases of Italian life are vividly reproduced.²⁶ Other writers like Edmund D. Griffin, George H. Calvert, Orville Dewey, Nathaniel H. Carter, J. T. Hadley, and Bayard Taylor, followed the example of Sloan and Tuckerman and by their writings threw further light upon the customs, habits, literature and art of the Italian people.

During the long struggle for independence a number of Italian exiles sought refuge from persecution in America. Among them were men of real culture who on reaching this country where everything was so new to them, resorted to teaching their own native tongue as the most practical means to earn a livelihood. In those days modern languages were not in great vogue; very few institutions of learning had as yet introduced them in their curriculum, but to such students as were interested in them the Faculty would

²³ For a review of *Rambles in Italy* see *North American Review*, vol. 9, 1819.

²⁴ Philadelphia, 1835.

²⁵ Preface to the *Sketch Book*.

²⁶ Henry Tuckerman was also the author of a number of *Essays, Biographical and Critical* (Boston, Phillips, Sampson Co., 1857), dealing with such authors as Giacomo Leopardi, Massimo D'Azeglio, and Silvio Pellico. He was especially interested in the Italian School of New York, the pupils of which attended his funeral in a body as a final token of their love. (*Harper's Weekly*, January 6, 1872.)

recommend certain resident foreigners from whom they could receive instruction at their own expense.²⁷ Hence it followed that the majority of these Italians settled in college towns or in the near surroundings, where they would offer their services not only to students, but also to University professors.

"In the autumn of 1824 and the spring of 1825," writes George Ticknor, "an accomplished Italian exile was in Boston, and partly to give him occupation and partly from the pleasure and improvement to be obtained from it, I invited the unfortunate scholar to come three or four times a week and read aloud to me from the principal poets of his country. Prescott joined me in it regularly, and sometimes we had one or two friends with us. In this way we went over large portions of the *Divina Commedia* and the whole of the *Gerusalemme Liberata*, parts of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, and several plays of Alfieri. The sittings were very agreeable, sometimes protracted to two or three hours, and we not only had earnest and amusing if not always very profitable discussions about what we heard, but sometimes we followed them afterwards with careful inquiries. The pleasure of the meetings however, was their great attraction. The Italian scholar read well and we enjoyed it very much."²⁸

Through the teaching of these men Italian acquired a new and vigorous impulse, so much so that, in 1824, the editor of the *North American Review* could well refer to its popularity in these words:

"In the present age of intellectual activity, attention is so generally bestowed on all modern languages which are ennobled by a literature that it is not singular an acquaintance with Italian in particular should be widely diffused."

As the demand for Italian increased, Italian scholars were given permanent positions in various universities and colleges, and were thus enabled to reach a larger number of students and promote still further the study of their native language in America. Foremost among these pioneer teachers were Pietro Bachi and Lorenzo da Ponte. The former was a graduate of the University of Padua, and had been exiled from Italy because of his implication in Murat's

²⁷ *General Catalogue of Bowdoin College, 1794-1894.*

²⁸ *Life of William H. Prescott*, by George Ticknor, p. 71. Boston, Ticknor & Fields, 1864.

attempt to ascend the throne of Naples in 1815. After wandering through England for some years he came to America, and in 1825 was appointed Instructor of Italian and Spanish in Harvard University. At that time the Modern Language Department of Harvard was still in its infancy, having been introduced only as late as 1819. By 1838, however, we already find ninety-two students in Italian as compared to twenty-three in Spanish and forty-two in German, a fact which is truly remarkable when one considers that all languages were elective and that the majority of students in Italian were pursuing this study entirely beyond the regular college course and were receiving no credits for their work. Mr. Bachi's connection with Harvard University lasted for over twenty years and during that extensive period hundreds of young men were successfully instructed in the Tuscan speech and properly prepared for their courses in Italian literature. Mr. Hale, in a letter to Theodore W. Koch, said of him:

"His work in the Italian Department was excellent. As a critic of Dante, he had exactly the gift which a good teacher ought to have in interesting wide-awake young men in this study. And I can say to you that when we came to hear Longfellow lecture, we were more than prepared for his lectures by the very thorough work which Bachi had done in this same subject with us."^{29, 30}

Lorenzo da Ponte, a poet of renown and the well-known librettist of *Don Giovanni* and *Le Nozze di Figaro*, was also an exile, a satirical sonnet against Count Pisani having been the cause of his banishment from his beloved Venice. He first sought refuge in Austria and later migrated to the United States. In New York, where he finally settled, he opened a little book store and earned his livelihood by the sale of Italian books and wares. Moreover, being especially fond of literature, he thought of devoting part of his time to teaching, and began to offer private lessons in the language of his native country. This new enterprise turned out far better than he expected, for many young men and women of distinguished families

²⁹ *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Dante Society*, p. 38. Cambridge, Mass., May 19, 1896.

³⁰ It is to be observed that Pietro Bachi was also the author of an Italian grammar which he wrote especially for his classes and was used as a text-book for many years at Harvard University.

profited by the occasion and applied for instruction. The gratifying success which he attained as a teacher is well brought out in the many letters in Italian which he received from his pupils and which he himself published with his *Memoirs*. When his students had been well drilled in the rudiments of the language, he passed to the literature and introduced them to the best Italian poets and prose writers, expounding to them the works of Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio and of all the other great lights, including Alfieri and Metastasio.

In his *Storia incredibile ma vera* of 1833⁸¹ Da Ponte has left us a record of his achievements in this field. He says,

“Sono passati ormai venti otto anni da che vivo in America. Conobbi all'arrivo mio che niente vi si sapea della lingua e letteratura italiana, e animato da patrio zelo e dall'amore del bene, credei che fosse cosa da me l'introdurvele. Se quegli, dicev'io che porta un' erba salutare, un fiore leggiadro, una pianta di frutto raro in un paese straniero, è dalla gente lodato, di quanta maggior lode non dee reputarsi degno colui che per la prima volta vi porta la più dolce di tutte le moderne favelle e la più vasta e ammirabile letteratura? Io toccava l'anno cinquantesimo sesto quando giunsi in America, e all'anno cinquantesimo nono mi posi al nobile cimento. Sono ora vicino all'ottantesimo quinto, e in questo spazio di tempo, io solo, io non favorito dalla fortuna, anzi da continue disavventure e peripezie travagliato e sbattuto, ebbi il costante coraggio d'introdurre e questa lingua e questa letteratura nella più ampia parte del globo, d'instruire più di due mila persone, di spargerne il fulgore per tutte le sue principali città, di eccitare l'ammirazione e il desiderio de' suoi tesori colle pubbliche letture, cogli scritti, colle autorità, coi cataloghi degli scrittori difenderle se criticate da sciole, da invidi, da ignoranti, e di elevarle a cotanta altezza, che non solamente note, ma care e pregiate divennero ai più colti e svegliati della Nazione, e a' veri amatori dell'utile e dilettevole. Consecrando per venticinque anni continui, il tempo, le cure e gli studii alla gloria della mia patria, trassi da varie parti d'Europa più di 24,000 volumi di scelte opere; e quanto di più mirabile ha l'antica e moderna italica scola nelle più gravi e astruse scienze, non che nelle belle lettere ed arti, fu recato da me negli Stati Uniti d'America, incominciando da Dante coi suoi migliori contemporanei e dall'immortal Galileo al La Granzia . . . fino alle odierne leggiadrissime produzioni.”

From 1826 to 1837 Da Ponte held a professorship at Columbia College, which, however, was in reality a private tutorship, carrying

⁸¹ Nuova Jorca, Joseph Desnoues. 1833.

no salary from the college itself. Through his suggestion and co-operation, many Italian books of literature were given a place on the shelves of the college library and were made accessible to the student body of that institution. In 1833 Italian Grand Opera was auspiciously initiated in New York under his direction, and a new source of interest was thus created by him in the language of Italy.

While men of Da Ponte's type devoted themselves to the diffusion of the study of Italian, patriots like Maroncelli,³² Garibaldi, and Foresti endeavored to arouse among the inhabitants of this country an interest in Italy's Wars of Independence. In this they were very successful and as a result the popular books of fiction of Manzoni, Rufini, Mariotti, D'Azeglio and Guerrazzi which gave expression to the wrongs and aspirations of the Italians obtained a large circulation throughout the United States.³³

With so many forces working towards the same end, Italian constantly gained in popular favor. In 1838 G. Palfrey wrote in the *North American Review*:

"Few modern languages are more generally studied than the Italian. Whether this is to be attributed to its velvet smoothness, or the general persuasion of its easy acquisition, or the general diffusion of the music of Bellini, it is certain that in all Europe that language ranks with the English in its commercial, the German in its literary, and the French in its diplomatic importance. The ladies of the Eastern cities of America are rivalling Europe in this, and in other branches of literary culture. One Hundred young men are annually trained to the acquirement of it in Harvard College. All persons who have any pretention to learning have more or less had something to do with Italian."

Yet all this marks but the dawn of Italian culture in America. The period of its greatest splendor was soon to follow. It came through the efforts of Ticknor, Sumner, Longfellow, Prescott, Legaré, Edward Everett, George Washington Greene, Allston, Parsons, Bayard Taylor, Fenimore Cooper, Margaret Fuller,

³² Maroncelli, the fellow prisoner of Silvio Pellico at Spielberg, was also a teacher of his native language. He lived in Cambridge, Mass., for some time and in 1836 contributed to Mrs. Andrews Norton's translation of *Le Mie Prigioni*, the additions and some of the miscellaneous writings of Silvio Pellico.

³³ *Mount Vernon Papers*, 1859, p. 293.

Hawthorne, Bryant, Lowell and Charles Eliot Norton, who followed the study of Italian farther than others and are truly representative of the literary relations which have always existed between Italy and the United States.³⁴

EMILIO GOGGIO

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

³⁴ Italian influences on these authors will be discussed in a separate article on *The Literary Relations between Italy and the United States*.

A CATALOGUE OF ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF SPANISH PLAYS

- Álvarez Quintero, Serafin (1871—), and Joaquín (1873—).
El centenario. 3 acts. 1910.
Papa Juan; or The Centenarian; tr. by Thomas Walsh.
 In *Poet Lore*, XXIX, No. 3. Bost. 1918.
- Fortunato*. 3 scenes. 1912.
Fortunato; tr. by Anna Sprague MacDonald. The Sun-
 wise Turn, Inc. N. Y. 1918.
- Hablando se entiende la gente*. 1 act.
By Their Words Ye Shall Know Them; tr. by J. G. Under-
 hill. In *The Drama*, No. 25. Chic. Feb., 1917.
- Malvaloca*. 3 acts. 1912.
Malvaloca; tr. by Jacob S. Fassett, Jr. In *Drama League*
Series, Vol. XIX. N. Y. Doubleday, 1916.
- Mañana de sol*. 1 act. 1905.
A Bright Morning; tr. by Carlos C. Castillo and E. L.
 Overman. In *Poet Lore*, XXVII, No. 6. Bost. 1916.
- Puebla de las mujeres*. 2 acts. 1912.
The Women's Town; tr. by C. A. Turrell. In *Contem-
 porary Spanish Dramatists*. Bost. Badger, 1919.
- Benavente y Martínez, Jacinto (1866—).
La gobernadora. 3 acts. 1901.¹
The Governor's Wife; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Plays by*
Jacinto Benavente, 2d series. N. Y. Scribner, 1919.
 — Same. In *Poet Lore*, XXIX, No. 1. Bost. 1918.
- Los intereses creados*. Prologue and 3 acts. 1907.¹
The Bonds of Interest; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Plays by*
Jacinto Benavente. N. Y. Scribner, 1917.
 — Same. In *The Drama*, No. 20. Chic. 1915.
- Los malhechores del bien*. 2 acts. 1905.¹
The Evil Doers of Good; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Plays*
by Jacinto Benavente. N. Y. Scribner, 1917.

¹ Date of first performance.

- La malquerida*. 3 acts. 1913.¹
The Passion Flower; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Plays by Jacinto Benavente*. N. Y. Scribner, 1917.
- El marido de su viuda*. 1 act. 1908.
His Widow's Husband; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Plays by Jacinto Benavente*. N. Y. Scribner, 1917.
- No fumadores*. 1 act. 1904.¹
No Smoking; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Plays by Jacinto Benavente*. 2d series. N. Y. Scribner, 1919.
 — Same. In *The Drama*, No. 25. Chic. 1917.
- La noche del sábado*. 5 tableaux. 1904.
Saturday Night; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Poet Lore*, No. 2. Bost. 1918.
- La princesa Bebé*. 4 acts. 1905.
Princess Bebé; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Plays by Jacinto Benavente*, 2d series. N. Y. Scribner, 1919.
- El príncipe que todo lo aprendió en los libros*. 2 acts and 5 scenes. 1910.
The Prince Who Learned Everything Out of Books; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Poet Lore*, XXIX, No. 5. Bost. 1918.
- Rosas de otoño*. 3 acts. 1905.
Autumnal Roses; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Plays by Jacinto Benavente*, 2d series. N. Y. Scribner, 1919.
- La sonrisa de Gioconda*. 1 act. 1908.
The Smile of Mona Lisa; tr. by John Armstrong Herman. Bost. Badger, [1915].
- Calderón de la Barca, Pedro, 1600–1681.
El alcalde de Zalamea. 3 acts.
The Mayor of Zalamea; tr. by Edward Fitzgerald. In *Six Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. 1853; N. Y. Dodge, 1905.
 — Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Works*. Vol. II. N. Y. 1887.
 — Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Letters and Literary Remains*. Vol. II. Lond. 1889.
 — Same. In *Eight Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. Macmillan, 1906.

¹ Date of first performance.

Amar después de la muerte. 3 acts.

Love After Death; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Dramas of Calderón, Tragic, Comic and Legendary*. 2 vol. Lond. 1853.

Amar, y ser amado, y divina Philotea. 1 act.

The Divine Philothea; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Mysteries of Corpus Christi*. Dublin, 1867.

La banda y la flor. 3 acts.

The Scarf and the Flower; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Dramas of Calderón, etc.* Lond. 1853.

La cena de Baltasar. 1 act.

Belshazzar's Feast; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Mysteries of Corpus Christi*. Dublin, 1867.

— Same. In A. Bates, *The Drama*. Vol. IV. Lond. 1903.

La dama duende. 3 acts.

The Fairy Lady; tr. by Lord Holland. In *Three Comedies Translated from the Spanish*. Lond. 1807.

La devoción de la Cruz. 3 acts.

The Devotion of the Cross; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Love the Greatest Enchantment, etc.* Lond. 1861.

— Same. In *Three Dramas of Calderón*. Dublin. 1870.

Los dos amantes del cielo: Crisanto y Daria. 3 acts.

The Two Lovers of Heaven: Chrysanthus and Daria; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Atlantis: or, Register of Literature and Science*. Vol. V. Lond. 1870.

— Same. (Printed separately.) Lond. 1870.

Los encantos de la culpa. 1 act.

The Sorceries of Sin; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Love the Greatest Enchantment, etc.* Lond. 1861.

— Same. In *Three Dramas of Calderón*. Dublin. 1870.

El escondido y la tapada. 3 acts.

'Tis Well It's No Worse; adapted by Isaac Bickerstaffe. Lond. 1770.

El gran Príncipe de Fez. 3 acts.

- The Prince of Fes*; adapted by the Rev. P. Kaenders. St. Louis. Herder, 1905.
- El gran teatro del mundo*. 1 act.
The Great Theatre of the World; tr. in part by R. C. Trench. In *Life's a Dream*. 2d ed. Lond. 1856.
- Guárdate del agua mansa*. 3 acts.
Beware of Smooth Water; tr. by Edward Fitzgerald. In *Six Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. 1853; N. Y. Dodge, 1905.
 — Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Works*. Vol. II. N. Y. 1887.
 — Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Letters and Literary Remains*. Vol. II. Lond. 1889.
 — Same. In *Eight Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. Macmillan, 1906.
- Luis Pérez el Gallego*. 3 acts.
Gil Pérez the Gallician; tr. by Edward Fitzgerald. In *Six Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. 1853; N. Y. Dodge, 1905.
 — Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Works*. Vol. II. N. Y. 1887.
 — Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Letters and Literary Remains*. Vol. III. Lond. 1889.
 — Same. In *Eight Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. Macmillan, 1906.
- El mágico prodigioso*. 3 acts.
Justina; tr. by J. H. (D. F. MacCarthy). Lond. 1848.
The Mighty Magician; tr. by Edward Fitzgerald. Bungay. 1877.
 — Same. In *Eight Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. Macmillan, 1906.
 — Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Letters and Literary Remains*. Vol. III. Lond. 1889.
- The Wonder-Working Magician*; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Calderón's Dramas*. Lond. 1873.
- El mayor encanto amor*. 3 acts.
Love the Greatest Enchantment; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Love the Greatest Enchantment*, etc. Lond. 1861.

- Same. In *Three Dramas of Calderón*. Dublin. 1870.
- El médico de su honra*. 3 acts.
The Physician of His Own Honour; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. 1853.
- Nadie fie su secreto*. 3 acts.
Keep Your Own Secret; tr. by Edward Fitzgerald. In *Six Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. 1853; Dodge, 1905.
- Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Works*. Vol. II. N. Y. 1887.
- Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Letters and Literary Remains*. Vol. II. Lond. 1889.
- Same. In *Eight Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. Macmillan, 1906.
- Keep Your Own Secret*; tr. by Lord Holland. In *Three Comedies, etc.* Lond. 1807.
- No siempre lo peor es cierto*. 3 acts.
Elvira: or, The Worst Not Always True; tr. by George Digby, Earl of Bristol. Lond. 1667.
- Peor está que estaba*. 3 acts.
From Bad to Worse; tr. by F. Holcroft. In *The Theatrical Recorder, etc.* Lond. 1805.
- El pintor de su deshonra*. 3 acts.
The Painter of His Own Dishonour; tr. by Edward Fitzgerald. In *Six Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. 1853; N. Y. Dodge, 1905.
- Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Works*. Vol. II. N. Y. 1887.
- Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Letters and Literary Remains*. Vol. II. Lond. 1889.
- Same. In *Eight Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. Macmillan, 1906.
- El príncipe constante*. 3 acts.
The Constant Prince; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. 1853.
- El purgatorio de San Patricio*. 3 acts.
The Purgatory of St. Patrick; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Dramas of Calderón, etc.* Lond. 1853.

- Same. In *Calderón's Dramas*. Lond. 1873.
- El secreto a voces*. 3 acts.
- The Secret in Words*; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Dramas of Calderón*, etc. Lond. 1853.
- Las tres justicias en una*. 3 acts.
- Three Judgements at a Blow*; tr. by Edward Fitzgerald. In *Six Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. 1853; N. Y. Dodge, 1905.
- Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Works*. Vol. II. N. Y. 1887.
- Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Letters and Literary Remains*. Vol. II. Lond. 1889.
- Same. In *Eight Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. Macmillan, 1906.
- La vida es sueño*. 3 acts.
- Life Is a Dream*; tr. by D. F. MacCarthy. In *Calderón's Dramas*. Lond. 1873.
- Same. In Brander Matthews, ed. *The Chief European Dramatists*. Bost. Houghton, 1916.
- Life's a Dream*; tr. in part by R. C. Trench. In *Life's a Dream*, etc. Lond. 1856.
- Same. 2d ed. Lond. Macmillan, 1880.
- Such Stuff As Dreams Are Made Of*; tr. by Edward Fitzgerald. In *The Mighty Magician*, etc. Bungay. 1877.
- Same. In Edward Fitzgerald, *Letters and Literary Remains*. Vol. III, Lond. 1889.
- Same. In *Eight Dramas of Calderón*. Lond. Macmillan, 1906.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de, 1547-1616.
- La Numancia*. 4 acts.
- Numantia, a Tragedy*; tr. by Gordon Willoughby James Gyll. In *The Voyage to Parnassus*, etc. Lond. Murray, 1870.
- Numantia, a Tragedy*; tr. by James Y. Gibson. Lond. Paul, 1885.
- El trato de Argel*. 4 acts.

The Commerce of Algiers; tr. by Gordon Willoughby James Gyll. In *The Voyage to Parnassus* etc. Lond. 1870.

Dicenta, Joaquín, 1860–1917.

Juan José. 3 acts. 1895.

Juan José; tr. by Mark Skidmore. In *Contemporary Spanish Dramatists*, by C. A. Turrell. Bost. Badger. 1919.

Echegaray, José, 1832–1916.

La cantante callejera. 1 act. 1896.¹

The Street Singer; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *The Drama*, No. 25. Chic. 1917.

El gran Galeoto. 3 acts. 1881.¹

The Great Galeoto; tr. by Caroline Sheldon. Grinnell, Iowa, Ray & Frisbie, 1912.

The Great Galeoto; tr. by J. S. Fassett, Jr. Bost. Badger, [1914]. (Contemporary Dramatists' Series.)

The Great Galeoto; tr. by Hannah Lynch, with an introduction by Elizabeth R. Hunt. N. Y. Doubleday, 1914. (Drama League Series of Plays, Vol. III.)

— Same; tr. with an introduction by Hannah Lynch. N. Y. Lane, n. d.

The Great Galeoto; tr. by Eleanor Bontecou. In B. H. Clark, ed. *Masterpieces of Modern Spanish Drama*. N. Y. Duffield, 1917.

The World and His Wife; tr. by C. F. Nirdlinger. N. Y. Kennerley, 1908.

El hijo de Don Juan. 3 acts. 1892.¹

The Son of Don Juan; tr. by James Graham. Bost. Little, Brown & Co., 1895, 1903, 1911.

El hombre negro. 3 acts. 1898.¹

The Man in Black; tr. by Ellen Watson. In Garnett, Vallée and Brandl, eds. *The Universal Anthology*. N. Y. Merrill, [1899–1902].

El loco Dios. 4 acts. 1900.¹

The Madman Divine; tr. by Elizabeth H. West. In *Poet Lore*, XIX. Bost. 1908.

¹ Date of first performance.

- Same. Bost. Badger, 1912. (Poet Lore Plays.)
- Mariana*. 3 acts. 1892.¹
- Mariana*; tr. by James Graham. Lond. Unwin, n. d.
- Same. Bost. Little, Brown & Co., 1903.
- Mariana*; tr. by Federico Sarda and Carlos D. S. Wuppermann. N. Y. Moods Publishing Company, 1910.
- Same. N. Y. Boni & Liveright, Inc., 1918.
- O locura o santidad*. 3 acts. 1877.¹
- Folly or Saintliness*; tr. with an introduction by Hannah Lynch. In *The Great Galeoto*. N. Y. Lane, n. d.
- Madman or Saint*; tr. by Ruth Lansing. In *Poet Lore*, XXIII. Bost. 1912.
- Siempre en ridículo*. 3 acts. 1890.¹
- Always Ridiculous*; tr. by T. Walter Gilkyson. Bost. Badger, 1916. (Poet Lore Plays, Series 2.)
- Same. In *Poet Lore*, XXVII. Bost. 1916.
- Guimerá, Ángel, 1847—
- La pecadora*. 3 acts. 1902.¹
- La Pecadora (Daniela)*; tr. by Wallace Gillpatrick. N. Y. Hispanic Society (Putnam), 1916.
- Daniela*; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In B. H. Clark, ed. *Masterpieces of Modern Spanish Drama*. N. Y. 1917.
- Terra baixa*. (Spanish, *Tierra baja*). 3 acts. 1896.
- Marta of the Lowlands*; tr. into Spanish by José Echegaray and into English by Wallace Gillpatrick, with an introduction by J. G. Underhill. N. Y. Doubleday, 1914. (Drama League Series of Plays, Vol. VIII.)
- Linares Rivas, Manuel, 1866—
- La garra*. 2 acts. 1914.
- The Claws*; tr. by C. A. Turrell. In *Contemporary Spanish Dramatists*. Bost. Badger, 1919.
- Marquina, Eduardo, 1879—
- Cuando florezcan los rosales*. 3 acts. 1913.
- When the Roses Bloom Again*; tr. by C. A. Turrell. In *Contemporary Spanish Dramatists*. Bost. Badger, 1919.

¹ Date of first performance.

- Martínez Sierra, Gregorio, 1881-
Canción de cuna. 2 acts. 1911.¹
The Cradle Song; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Poet Lore*,
 XXVIII, No. 6. Bost. 1917.
Hechizo de amor. 1 act and 2 scenes. 1908.¹
Love Magic; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *The Drama*, No.
 25. Chic. Feb., 1917.
- Moreto y Cavaña, Agustín, 1618-1669.
El desdén con el desdén. 3 acts.
Donna Diana; adapted "from the German version" by
 Westland Marston. *Dramatic and Poetical Works*,
 Vol. II. Lond. 1876.
Love's Victory; or, The School for Pride; adapted by G.
 Hyde. Lond. and Edinburgh. 1825.
- Los pastores* (anonymous).
Los Pastores, a Mexican Play of the Nativity; tr. by M.
 R. Cole. Bost. Houghton, 1907.
- Pérez Galdós, Benito, 1845-
El abuelo. 5 acts. 1897.¹
The Grandfather; tr. by Elizabeth Wallace. In *Poet Lore*,
 XXI. Bost. 1910.
Electra. 5 acts. 1901.¹
Electra; tr. anonymously. In *The Drama*, No. 2. Chic.
 1911.
Electra; tr. by C. A. Turrell. In *Contemporary Spanish*
Dramatists. Bost. Badger, 1919.
- La de San Quentín*. 3 acts. 1894.¹
The Duchess of San Quentín; tr. by P. M. Hayden. In B.
 H. Clark, ed. *Masterpieces of Modern Spanish Drama*.
 N. Y. 1917.
- Roxas Zorrilla, Francisco de, 1607-1648.
Los vandos de Verona, Montescos y Capeletes. 3 acts.
Los Bandos de Verona, Montescos y Capeletes; tr. in part
 by F. W. Cosens. Lond. 1874.

¹ Date of first performance.

Rueda, Lope de, 1510?-1565.

El paso séptimo (Las aceitunas). 1 act.

The Olives; tr. by G. H. Lewis. In *The Spanish Drama*. Lond. 1845.

The Seventh Farce of Lope de Rueda; tr. by W. H. H. Chambers. In A. Bates. *The Drama*, Vol. VI. Lond. 1903.

Rusiñol, Santiago, 1861-

El titella prodig. 1 act and 4 scenes. [1911.]

The Prodigal Doll; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *The Drama*, No. 25. Chic. Feb., 1917.

Tamayo y Baus, Manuel, 1829-1898.

Un drama nuevo. 3 acts. 1867.¹

A New Drama; tr. by J. D. Fitzgerald and T. H. Guild. N. Y. Hispanic Society, 1915.

Torres Naharro, Bartolomé de. —1531?

Comedia hymenea. 5 acts.

Hymen (Comedia Himenea); tr. by W. H. H. Chambers. In A. Bates. *The Drama*, Vol. VI. Lond. 1903.

Valle-Inclán, Ramón del, 1870-

La cabeza del dragón. 6 scenes. 1914.

The Dragon's Head; tr. by May Heywood Brown. In *Poet Lore*, XXIX, No. 5. Bost. 1918.

Vega Carpio, Lope Félix de, 1562-1635.

Castelvines y Montesés. 3 acts.

Castelvines y Montesés. Tragi-comedia; tr. by F. W. Cosens. Lond. 1869.

Romeo and Juliet. (A summary and abridged translation.) For W. Griffin. Lond. 1770.

La estrella de Sevilla. 3 acts.

The Star of Seville; tr. by P. M. Hayden. In Brander Matthews, ed. *The Chief European Dramatists*. Bost. 1916.

El mejor alcalde el rey. 3 acts.

The King The Greatest Alcalde; tr. by J. G. Underhill. In *Poet Lore*, XXIX, No. 4. Bost. 1918.

¹ Date of first performance.

El padre engañado. 1 act.

The Father Outwitted; a Spanish Interlude. In *The Theatrical Recorder*, etc., Vol. II. Lond. 1805.

El perro del hortelano. 3 acts.

The Dog in the Manger; tr. by W. H. H. Chambers. In A. Bates. *The Drama*, Vol. VI. Lond. 1903.

Zamacois, Eduardo (1873—).

Los reyes pasan. 1 act. 1912.

The Passing of the Magi; tr. by C. A. Turrell. In *Contemporary Spanish Dramatists*. Bost. Badger, 1919.

ELIJAH CLARENCE HILLS

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MISCELLANEOUS

PURGATORIO XI. 2-3 AND PARADISO XIV. 30

IN Dante's paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer in the *Purgatorio* (XI. 1 ff.) God is addressed as in heaven not because he is limited to any place, but because in his love for his earliest works, heaven and the angels, he is there in a special sense;

O Padre nostro, che nei cieli stai,
Non circoscritto, ma per più amore,
Che ai primi effetti di lassù tu hai.

The idea seems to be borrowed from the 187th epistle of St. Augustine, that to Dardanus *De praesentia Dei*, cap. V. sec. 16:

Unde fatendum est ubique esse Deum per divinitatis praesentiam, sed non ubique per habitationis gratiam. Propter hanc enim habitationem ubi procul dubio gratia dilectionis ejus agnoscitur, non dicimus, Pater noster qui es ubique, cum et hoc verum est, sed, Pater noster qui es in coelis; . . . Si enim populus Dei nondum factus aequalis Angelis ejus adhuc in ista peregrinatione dicitur templum ejus, quanto magis est templum ejus in coelis, ubi est populus Angelorum, etc.¹

The wise in the sphere of the sun sing praises to the transcendent Trinity (*Par.* XIV. 28-30):

¹ Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XXXIII, col. 838. This work is never mentioned by Dr. Moore (*Studies in Dante*, vols. I-IV) among the large number of works by St. Augustine illustrating or used by Dante. Cf. also Augustine's *De sermone Domini in monte*, II, v. 17-18 (*Patr. Lat.*, XXXIV, 1276-7). Nothing cited by Scartazzini or Vernon (*Readings on the Purgatorio*, I, 376) contains the full idea. The remote parallel quoted by Scartazzini wrongly as from *De civ. Dei* is in Augustine's *De diversis quaestionibus*, XX (*Patr. Lat.*, XL, 15). As to the early commentators, Dante's son Pietro quotes inexactly a remote parallel, really from Peter Lombard (see later in this article), which he fathers on "Gualfredus in poetria"; who this is I do not know; it is not Geffroi de Vinsauf, author of the *Poetria nova*, in which there is nothing to the purpose. Of Benvenuto da Imola's illustration, the second part seems to be from Isidor of Seville, *Sententiae*, I, ii, 3 (*P. L.*, LXXXIII, 541), or Albertus Magnus, *Summa*, Quaest. LXX. (ed. Borgnet, vol. XXXI, 729), and the third part may be a reminiscence of Augustine's *De praes. Dei*, V, xvi.

Quell' uno e due e tre che sempre vive,
E regna sempre in tre e due ed uno,
Non circonscritto, e tutto circonscrive.

The phraseology recalls the passage from the *Purgatorio*, and the thought one in the *Convivio*.² Both are found repeatedly in early and medieval theological writers.

St. Gregory, *Moralia*, XVI. xxxi: Incircumscribitur namque spiritus [Deus] omnia intra semetipsum habet.³

Isidor of Seville, *Sententiae*, I. ii: [Deum] ideo exteriorem, ut incircumscribita magnitudinis suae immensitate omnia concludat.⁴

Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis*, I. iii. 17: Quod Deus . . . et in omni loco sine circumscriptione. . . . Nec tamen loco comprehenditur [divina natura] ullo, quoniam omnino incircumscribitibilis est. Est ergo ubi est totum quae continet totum.⁵

Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, I. xxxvii: Fateamur itaque divinam naturam . . . omnino incircumscribitilem, nullo concludi loco. . . . Ita Deus sine labore regens et continens mundum, in coelo totus est, in terra totus, et in utroque totus, et nullo contentus loco.⁶

Less near in wording, but antithetical like Dante's line, are the following:

St. Augustine in his epistle to Dardanus *De praesentia Dei*, cap. IV: Sed sic est Deus per cuncta diffusus, ut non sit qualitas mundi; sed substantia creatrix mundi, sine labore regens, et sine onere continens mundum . . . et nullo contentus loco, sed in seipso ubique

² In connection with the limited jurisdiction of nature: "e anche è di costei limitatore Colui che da nulla è limitato, cioè la prima Bontà, ch' è Iddio, che solo colla infinita capacità l' infinito comprende (IV, ix).

³ *Patr. Lat.*, LXXV, 1140.

⁴ *Patr. Lat.*, LXXXIII, 541.

⁵ *Patr. Lat.*, CLXXVI, 223-4 (cf. cap. xviii).

⁶ Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, CXCII, 625-6; expounded by Albertus Magnus in his commentary on the first book of the *Sentences* (ed. Borgnet, XXVI, 269). Other similar passages are in Prudentius in his poem *Apotheosis*, 862-4 (*P. L.*, LIX, 989); St. Augustine, in a sermon, and *Confessions*, V, ii (*P. L.*, XXXVIII, 157, and XXXII, 707); St. Gregory, *Moralia*, II, xii, XVI, viii (*P. L.*, LXXXV, 565-6, 1126); Raterius, bishop of Verona in the tenth century (*P. L.*, CXXXVI, 707); Peter Damian, *De divina omnipotentia*, VI (*P. L.*, CXLV, 604-5); St. Anselm, *Proslogion*, XIII (*P. L.*, CLVIII, 234; ed. Haas, I, 118-9). Cf. also Boccaccio's *Filostrato*, II, 41, "colui che il mondo circonscribbe." Dante's idea but not his words are in Boccaccio's *De genealogia deorum*, XV, 9 (p. 394, Basilae, 1532; p. 281, Hecker, *Boccaccio Funde*), where God is spoken of as "omnia intra se continentem, & a nullo contentum."

totus. Ita Pater, ita Filius, ita Spiritus sanctus, ita Trinitas unus Deus.⁷

St. Anselm, *Proslogion*, cap. XIX: Nihil enim te [Deus] continet, sed tu continens omnia.⁸

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theol.*, I pars, quaest. viii. art. 1: Sed Deus non continetur a rebus, sed magis continet res.⁹

It has seemed worth while to cite so many passages in order to show parallels in almost every one of the early and medieval theological writers whom Dante was most familiar with.¹⁰ A comparison of all the passages found also strikingly exhibits the *aurea catena* formed by the Fathers and their successors.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

⁷ *P. L.*, XXXIII, 837; cf. also *De civ. Dei*, VII, xxx, *Confess.*, I, iii.

⁸ *P. L.*, CLVIII, 237.

⁹ Vol. IV, p. 82 (Rome, 1882-1906; cf. Iⁱⁱ, cii, 4 (containing half the idea, cited by Scartazzini, under *Purg.*, XI, 2). See also Isidor of Seville, *Etymologiae*, VII, i (*P. L.*, LXXXII, 263); the treatise *De anima*, IV, ii, printed among Hugh of St. Victor's works (*P. L.*, CLXXVII, 172); St. Bernard, sermons and *De charitate* (*P. L.*, CLXXXIII, 536 and 1169; CLXXXIV, 603-4); Albertus Magnus, *Summa theol.*, quaest. LXX (ed. Borgnet, XXXI 729, etc.), quoting St. Gregory inexactly and seemingly also Isidor, *Sententiae*, I, ii (*P. L.*, LXXXIII, 541). The passages are often incidental to a treatment of the divine immanence and transcendence; Dante emphasizes the latter. The Fathers on the whole discuss the nature of God with more fulness and originality than the Schoolmen do.

¹⁰ All except St. Bonaventura (mostly inaccessible to me) and Richard of St. Victor.

ADDITIONAL NOTES CONCERNING THE DESCEND-
ANTS OF GANELON—AND OF OTHERS¹

P. 150, l. 7. After "Scotland" read: "One finds the proverb 'Turn the bannock wi a fause Mentieth,'"² and it has been, etc.

P. 153, l. 10. For "tà" read "à."

Pp. 152-4. I find that I have been too bold in my conjecture that a passage, similar in content to those cited, upon the duties of the "roi d'armes," would certainly be found in *Le Comportement des armes* of "Sécille." My friend Professor Charles H. Haskins, when in Paris recently, was good enough to examine the manuscript, Bibliothèque nationale, f. fr. 387, and found that the pages of the treatise dealing with heralds (f. 25 ff.), was—as is the case with the majority of such works—concerned with their privileges, and not with their duties.

P. 155, l. 3. After "conceptions" read: In Scotland the tradition in regard to Menteith might be regarded as the source, if it were not the offspring, of the general belief that to place cakes with the wrong side uppermost before any one was accounted an insult, as when laid on the trencher, it was proper to have "the right side" uppermost.² In the North of England to put the loaf in such a position is considered, not as a personal insult, but as unlucky, while along the coast it is believed that for every loaf, so turned, a ship will be wrecked.³ Such an act is regarded in popular usage in France, etc.

P. 155, l. 12. For "as supposed," read "was supposed."

GEORGE L. HAMILTON

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

¹ R. R., X, 149-158.

² W. Gregor, *Notes on the Folk-Lore of the North-East of Scotland*, 1881, 31.

³ W. Henderson, *Notes on the Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties of England and the Borders*, 1879, 120.

REVIEWS

French Terminologies in the Making, by Dr. Harvey J. Swann. New York: Columbia University Press, 1918. 8vo, pp. xxii, 250.

It seems to be the natural inclination of a critic to approach with a hungry spirit of attack the scholarly work he has been appointed to review. It seems to be almost as "rare" a thing as a day in June to find a critic who humbly and frankly acknowledges that the author of a doctor's thesis delivered to his mercies may actually know more than the reviewer himself does about the subject matter treated.

Sometimes, the result of this resolute reticence is a destructive attitude which is determined to see only faults. Appreciation and praise are hardly consonant with knowledge, whispers the critic to himself. So he stifles any sign of approbation, which, in a critique, seems a sure indication of mental indigence.

The writer of this criticism rubs his mental elbows in painful reminiscence of what was done to his first book by a very young critic who knew more than the author did. Let it then be taken for granted at once that the present writer knows much less than does Dr. Swann about the subject in hand. Indeed the hours spent in perusing this work were hours of fruitful absorption of knowledge well presented.

Let us begin by stating that S. has undertaken to give us a perspective of how words are created under the impulsion of a great need, how a superfluity of terms is gradually developed by dint of usage, and how in the onward process the survival of the fittest occurs, while the wastage is relegated to the historical dictionary, if it is recorded at all. It is a fascinating subject, one that involves not only the requisite philosophical research, but also an endeavor to comprehend both the psychology of the speakers of words and the interplay of forces in the realm of thought and invention. Such a study has to be not merely an investigation of terminologies, but also a sincere effort to trace the "raison d'être" of the terms that eventually survive. This work would be the ambitious undertaking of a life-time if applied to the various movements of progress which gave birth to words. S. has limited himself in his thesis to three inventions, the railroad, the automobile and the airplane, and has then examined with interesting results the terminologies forced into life by the upheaval of 1789, with special reference to the Republican Calendar and the Metric System, and to the ideas of Liberty, Democracy and Equality. I think that even these Revolutionary fields of vocabulary growth would have sufficed for the requirements of a thesis. Yet I would not have foregone the interesting chapters on the word-elements "auto" and "aëro," chapters which read like tales of adventure among words. They make me think of Skeat's favorite diversion. The author has countered a fundamental criticism of his possible conclusions in such a subject by including in his research not only idea-words but also terms for scientific inventions. He has thus combined the concrete with the abstract and has prepared the way for com-

prehensiveness and soundness in his philological deductions. What interest these may have we shall presently see.

In the scientific field, he thus traces the plan he has set for himself (p. xviii) :

"We are now ready to inquire, What are the most favorable conditions for the study of new terminologies? And the answer is, The period of development of some important invention—not the gradual improvement of something already known but a definitely new and individual departure. Then almost certainly a novel designation will be called for. However, the invention must not be one that only specialists in some limited field will need to discuss. The new substances constantly being discovered in chemistry, for example, will not interest us, for their names never are subjected to the constant give-and-take of human intercourse whereby words become real parts of the living vocabulary. To suit our needs the invention must be one that immediately interests those who use the everyday speech. Thus we can hope for abundant examples in the newspapers and magazines which will enable us to trace the monthly and even weekly stages of the process by which it is named."

S. then proceeds to investigate the period from 1820 to 1840 during which the railroad got most of its names, the period from 1875 to 1895 during which the name "automobile" became the recognized term for what we might call, speaking after the *Précieuses*, the cushioned convenience for shopping, and the periods from 1783 to 1800 and from 1865 to 1890, at which two epochs the science of *aéronautics* made a popular appeal.

In the chapter on the Railroad terminology S. begins by tracing the development of the term "*chemin de fer*." In his list of names for the railroad (p. 7), he presents among others the terms "*chemin à fer*" and "*chemin en fer*." I think the author had an opportunity here to study why minds gravitated toward the preposition "*de*." In word development prepositions hold high rank and, if the material were available in S.'s research, a section on the psychology of the use of the preposition would have made a fascinating addition to his work. The study of the intricate use in French of "*en*" and "*de*" might have received some additional light. I presume it is difficult to advance any sound theories for the final prevalence of "*de*" in the case of "*chemin de fer*," but I cannot help entering into speculation on the subject. There may have been some interesting movement of thought in the popular progression from a "*chemin en fer*" to a "*chemin de fer*." It is true that the idiom to-day still permits "*un chapeau en paille*" and "*de paille*." Why cannot the same variation be played in the case of an iron road? Can the designation "*la voie ferrée*" have had some influence on the final choice of "*de*"? In this idea, one is at once opposed by the fact that "*ferré*" does not mean "*de fer*," just as "*doré*" does not mean "*d'or*."

It is a little amusing to have S. in his complete absorption in railroad terminology assure us that one of his authors is on the *wrong track* (p. 23). This is applying knowledge gained, no doubt. But it might be better just the same in some future edition to remove M. Perdonnet from his obviously dangerous place.

Reference is made (p. 29) to the present effort of the French to pronounce the "*ing*" in General Pershing's name. It is of interest to note here how before our General imposed this difficulty upon French throats, one could hear frequently in France many terms like "*le skating*, *le smoking*, *le footing*"; while "*Que c'est shocking!*" is a reproach to be employed at the slightest provocation.

The English word "*tender*" finally prevailed against the French term

"allège." In speaking of this fact, S. frankly admits that he is at a loss for the reason. And indeed it seems impossible to trace adequately the steps by which "tender" finally became the established term. Of course the popularity of English words in connection with the whole invention of the railroad helped greatly in this process. I think that a possible reason why "allège" was not accepted may be hinted at in the fact that even in the English terminology minds did not work along the idea of an assistance or a lightening of the burden of weight when they cast about for a name for the tender. "Allège" seems to indicate an inactive element and perhaps the popular conception of the whole new machine of transportation contained notions of force and activity which extended to all its parts and which were therefore not consonant with the passivity denoted by "allège." I can perhaps illustrate my idea by pointing out the fact that the word "tender" is not at all a passive term.

It is evident from the perusal of the second chapter (the one which treats of the word-element "auto"), that the author now has his bearings and can write with all the power lent him by a full possession of his facts. He has composed here a fascinating chapter on the philological adventures of an element that gathered force as it went on, till it became the powerful center of a numerous progeny. It is in this chapter that he develops the interesting conclusion which holds true for the railroad, automobile and airplane terminology, namely, that when a new invention appears in the world and is to be christened by popular usage, the minds of the people will turn toward a new name rather than toward an already familiar one. Darmesteter thinks this process takes less effort than that of burdening an old word with a new meaning. And S. adds that with a totally new word liberties can be taken and that this feeling prevails at a time when the old word is still serving temporarily. Thus "voiture locomobile" or "chariot à vapeur," while serviceable, give way in the popular mind to "automobile," which in turn has now been displaced by "auto."

It must have given S. a great deal of pleasure to score on Littré's supplement of 1877 by finding an earlier use of the word "automobile" than is here recorded. The "Littré" I have at hand is of 1863 and does not contain the word "automobile," not even as an adjective. Of course in any modern compilation, not only the word "une automobile" will be found, but even its abbreviation, "un auto." It is curious to note the change in gender between the parent word and its offspring, which change S. logically attributes to the prevalence of masculine words ending in "o," such as "Métro, kilo, vélo," etc. But the words in his list are all abbreviations of words originally masculine, "le Métropolitain, le kilogramme, le vélodrome," whereas the noun "photo" has retained the feminine gender of its parent substantive "photographie." Why not then "une auto?," which by the way a great many Frenchmen still say. Perhaps the analogy with "un auto," a sixteenth century abbreviation of "autodafé" (derivation "agere") may serve to indicate a possible gender feeling which pertains to nouns and which in the Romance mind invests them with a distinctive masculine or feminine quality. In this connection it might be of interest to suggest that a psychological study of the appreciation of gender might yield interesting results, a test, for example, carried on among fairly advanced students in French, and then another among others less advanced. Such an investigation might yield as one result some definite information concerning the psychological

appreciation of the gender quality of French nouns. I think it would be found that this phenomenon is closely bound up with the suggestiveness of sound. In all this I do not ignore the philological facts which have predetermined the gender of these nouns in their long journey from the Latin to the modern French.

The chapter on the word-element "aëro" is compendious and interesting. Of special value is the precision with which the author's researches enable him to fix 1875 as the year marking probably the first printed use of the word "aéroplane." While absolute precision on such a question is manifestly impossible, it is to S.'s credit that his work inspires us with the confidence that his date is correct. And we permit our thoughts to wander on and to become a prayer to American dictionary makers that they print the date of the earliest appearance of a word which has become part and parcel of the language. If this process were extended to newly coined phrases and even unfamiliar locutions which in time may become familiar, a student might have a surer means of discovering to what extent in a given time the ordinary vocabulary grouped about a certain center undergoes change and renovation.

I did miss from the chapter on the word-element "aëro" some mention, if slight, of the term "hangar" (apparently from *L. angarium*, for shoeing horses). Indeed in the preceding chapter a mention of the term "garage" (probably Fr.-Teut. origin) would have given a special sense of completeness to the work. I am quick to admit that these two words are not an essential part of S.'s investigation, but they are so commonly associated with the respective inventions that they house, that the curiosity is piqued concerning them, and how and when they first came to be used in these new associations. S. must have made these discoveries collaterally with the others, and perhaps he will find opportunity to publish from his notes what he has found concerning terms which are close kindred to those he reports in the first three chapters of his book.

The last four chapters of the thesis are devoted to the study of a more conscious verbal development and are excellently written. So interesting are they in their entirety that a short résumé cannot do them justice, while a criticism can well confine itself to being favorable. The author takes up the nomenclature of the calendar in his fourth chapter and the metric system in his fifth. He describes the vicissitudes of these new systems of measurement of time and space and hints at why the one failed whereas the other succeeded. To be perfectly accurate in one's deductions concerning the artificial imposition of a new vocabulary of measure, it seems to me it would be necessary to live in or very near the epoch in which the process is taking place. S. has wisely limited himself in these chapters to an accurate recording,—here and there, however, offering a hint or a guess, as it occurs to him, to explain some curious turn.

I cannot imagine a more profitable half-hour than one spent in the perusal of the chapter on the nomenclature of the calendar. The author has studied the original documents and drawn up in accurate form a record of the governmental attempts to reverse the ordinary calendar in order to eradicate all traces of Church influence from the direction of the lives of the people. The energy of this attempt, its adventures and its failure, makes a valuable record that I hardly believe has been presented before in so brief a form—and certainly not from the vocabulary point of view. The failure of the new system, S. is inclined to attribute to the strangeness of its designations.

One of the fleeting impressions I get from the chapter on the metric terminology is that apparently some inspiration for the advocating of a change in the matter of weights and measures was derived from England. S. quotes (p. 121) from a proposition made by M. L'Evêque d'Autun to consult with Englishmen concerning a standard system. Monseigneur defends this plan and pokes fun at the reputed enmity between England and France in these terms: "Plus d'une tête diplomatique trouvera certainement une grande extravagance dans ce projet de réunion entre peuples ennemis naturels, comme tout le monde sait et comme tout le monde a appris dans des livres très graves." I am very glad to meet this quotation. For me it has been one of the most extraordinary facts concerning the eighteenth century, that a close study of the literature of the epoch in France will never fail to show that the two countries, England and France, were only diplomatically at enmity. The literary tone toward England is nothing less than deferential. It would seem that in this century there was a growing intimacy between two peoples reputed to be antagonistic, a sort of preparation for the alliance which bears its fruit to-day. I permit myself to quote from my book, "European Characters in French Drama of the Eighteenth Century" from the chapter on the English: "Yet, in all these hard-fought battles (of the eighteenth century), the heart of neither country was very intimately concerned. This fact robs the struggle of its ardor and defeat of its sting. The wars of the eighteenth century are eminently created by cabinets and factitiously carried on by mercenaries." And again: "... it seems evident that Englishmen, taken as a race, could not appear antagonistic. The mass of either nation had little share in the political manœuvres of the clique in power." One likes to be sustained by the evidence of textual quotation and I wish to thank S. for this addition to my treasury on Anglo-French relationships of the eighteenth century.

In the understanding of the Revolutionary period, say from 1789 to 1799, the last three chapters devoted to the vocabulary of equality, liberty and democracy, add an inestimable reality which the pure history of the period often tries in vain to suggest. We find here vividly portrayed the chaos which pervaded the governmental organization transported to the realm of ideas and consequently to the language of the time. It is natural then that a mushroom growth of words results, very few of which survive. S. calculates (p. xx, introd.) that there were some 900 new words or words used in new senses or in new combinations, 571 of which were really new. These figures, carefully considered, give a fantastic measure of the vast upheaval which not only cast aside the outworn forms of political control but also rendered inadequate the old terms, the old language. To quote (p. 136):

"But can the needs of the orators of the Revolution be provided for so easily? A few dozen nouns forgotten and the language is rid of the old system of weights and measures. But can it as easily be rid of the inequalities imposed by the Bourbon aristocracy? More likely there are many linguistic Bastilles to be destroyed and more aristocrats of the vocabulary to be executed before the language can be purged of what was monarchical in it and can stand forth satisfactorily democratic."

Within the limits of this critique it is futile to undertake a complete résumé of the interesting findings of this investigation. Darmesteter said (*Création Nouvelle*, p. 7): "On ne s'est pas encore avisé d'étudier systématiquement le

vocabulaire d'une langue de manière à suivre dans les changements de l'expression le mouvement de la pensée." I do not know whether this sentence, catching in the mind of S., led him to the fruitful study which he presents in his thesis. It is certain, however, that the movement of ideas in one of the greatest epochs in the world's history is here studied from the angle of vocabulary, and inevitably a better understanding of the whole period results. I earnestly recommend these chapters to the historian.

There is a question that naturally comes to the mind when one sees the divisions into which S. has thrown his findings. He speaks in Chapter 6 of the terminology of the Idea of Equality, in Chapter 7 of that of Liberty, and in Chapter 8 of that of Democracy. He tries conscientiously to keep separate these three vocabulary groups and of course this is no easy matter. But the question suggested to me is: why does not S. adopt the three centers of idealism around which the Revolutionists themselves grouped their aspirations, namely, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity? Thus S. places "fraternité" under the terminology of the idea of equality. Though these two are fundamentally separate in their connotations, there is some justification for this procedure if it were necessary. But is it necessary to constitute a separate vocabulary for democracy? And if such a caption is created, why not include under it the terms designating the machinery of the new forms of government? Thus we find under the idea of Liberty such words as "convention, bulletin des lois, assemblée, ordre du jour, etc." I might add that S. classes the words "guillotine" under the idea of Liberty. A rather sardonic thing to do in these days of upheaval. I think that while either Liberty or Equality would have accommodated words for the new forms of government, Fraternity would have been a useful classification for the terms expressive of the idealistic tendencies of the epoch. To me Democracy does not represent an ideal but a practical effort at self-government.

In many places in the last chapters of the book, the author gives evidence that he has projected himself imaginatively into the Revolutionary period, and so he sometimes vividly sketches the psychological processes involved in these adventures of popular words. On page 176, after giving a list of terms like "rolandiste, robespierriste, septembriste, chouanisme, impatriotisme, orléanisme," etc., he hints at the spirit that animated this mushroom development: "Anybody could originate an -isme. Everybody could be an -iste. Repression of views belonged to the dead past. Liberty of expression had become a mania." Again on page 163 he thus explains the development of the word "révolution":

"And too the word *révolution*. This word also had always existed. There had been revolutions in Rome, in England. There had been one only recently in America. The word was known, was used on occasion, like such a word, say, as *phalanx* or *centurion*, but the occasions were rare. And then all of a sudden one day a king is told, 'Une révolte? C'est une révolution!' And the word commences its whirlwind career. 'Une révolution? C'est La Révolution!', its article is changed from the indefinite to the definite. It acquires a capital R if not capitals throughout. It becomes a proper noun."

Finally the author gives in his last chapter a rather vivid idea of the transition of vocabulary from the monarchical to the republican régime. The ingenious device he employs consists in contrasting, by juxtaposition, the vocabulary for similar ideas. Thus he presents in clear comparison a series of terms for the governing bodies and powers such as on the one hand, "assemblée

administrative, corps législatif, convention nationale, etc. . . .," while on the other we meet, "bureau des ministres, la couronne, chambre extraordinaire, etc. . . ." It is easy to see which vocabulary pertains to royalty and interesting to remark the complete casting out of a whole terminology as objectionable because of its association. S. traces in the second place the terms used to describe the functions of the governing bodies. Here he contrasts "proclamation, municipaliser, législation, etc. . . ." with "édit solennel, agir en souverain, les ordres d'un roi, etc. . . ." He uses the same method of contrast to illustrate the change of vocabulary in the political and governmental applications where this change was naturally most apparent. I think this method very effective and by it we get a sort of pictorial suggestion of the kaleidoscopic transformation of ideas and their verbal expression in the volcanic epoch of the Revolution.

Dauzat says (*La Langue française d'aujourd'hui*, p. 51): "Pour nommer les objets on recourt plus volontiers à l'emprunt étranger, et de préférence, à la formation savante." Surely in the progress of S.'s researches this tendency has been amply illustrated: in the case of the railroad, the borrowing being made from the English, in the case of the automobile and the airplane, from the classical tongues. It would have been interesting to ascertain, if possible, the impulses which lead a whole nation of talkers to mark their preference for the exotic in respect to vocabulary. A period of stress such as our Great War (which name, by the way, I offer as the historical title of the titanic struggle), affords a fine opportunity for vocabulary investigation such as S. has carried into the realm of invention and idealism of the past. The advantages of such a study carried on in the present and concentrated on the idealism and invention of these four and one half years of convulsion are too obvious to need comment. With the documents so numerous and so fully at hand, the psychology of vocabulary growth can be measured with greater accuracy and that side of the study more fully developed than was possible for S. in his delving into the past. The author feels this obstacle keenly and states, p. 237: "And yet we must not think that it is in fact unreasoning caprice that determines these choices. It is probable that there are really definite causes underlying them, only these causes are so subtle and the interplay among them is so delicate that investigation is baffled. We have here a great complex which as yet defies analysis."

Thus, while it seems a comparatively simple matter to account for the "tutoiement" which became the vogue at the beginning of the Revolution, one receives a fuller light on the French instinct toward the familiar "tu" in times of stress when one has heard the present-day "poilu" hail his unknown brother-in-arms. Read the conversations in Barbusse's "Le Feu" and you will conclude that the psychological basis of the "tutoiement" may not be altogether a sense of familiarity. I think it has deeper root and even goes back to a sense of absolute equality before the circumstances that call the instinct into play. I believe that Lamartine in his "Histoire des Girondins" never records the term "tu" as addressed to the king even by his most cruel jailers. I compare on the other hand scenes I have witnessed in hospitals in France where wounded men, as soon as they arrived, were hailed with the following set speech: "Here in the hospital we are for the moment no longer soldiers—just equals. Forget *Vous*." And the "tu" reigned in all succeeding conversation.

On p. 150, S. speaks of the modern activity of the element -crate and mentions "bureaucrate," and "bureaucratie." Though of a different element, the word "Lebureau" comes to my mind. Monsieur Lebureau is the general title given to the soulless red-tape individual who wallows in the "paperasserie" of a French government office.

I am reminded by the mention of Liberty Measles (p. 209) of the recent Liberty Cabbage for the erstwhile delectable sauerkraut of our enemies.

I wish to register here my hope that S., prepared by the arduous toil to which he has been put to collect the materials of this book, will turn his abilities to the study of the vocabulary generated by the present war. I think, for example, that the present slang of the war would offer a profitable field for psychological deductions, perfectly in line with the scholarly work accomplished by him in this volume. For let us not forget that (p. 231): "le suffrage universel n'a pas toujours existé en politique; il a existé de tout temps en matière de langue: là le peuple est tout-puissant et il est infaillible, parce que ses erreurs, tôt ou tard, font foi." The critical study of the "argot des tranchées" would be a service rendered to the future, for the French language five years hence will bear the final and lasting imprint of the linguistic upheaval occasioned by a war in which every soul in the nation was engaged. Such a study would enable S. to come nearer to the instincts and impulses which actuate speakers in their choice among competing terms. Such a study would make an important contribution to the psychology of speech. I do not mean a dictionary of argot, of which there are already many. Pick up a French newspaper to-day and you will see a mass of terms which five years ago would not have meant anything to the reader. Here are a few I have culled from one edition: Un Soviet de la Comédie Française, La Paix Wilsonienne, Les Sinnfeiners, la Russie Bolchévée par l'Allemagne, le premier cargo-boat en ciment, la débochisation de l'Alsace, les tickets de pain, etc.

English, French, German, American, Russian terms have crept into the popular usage of all languages as one event after another came up and struck the public mind. In the French language this process has been aided by the close relationship of the Allied soldiers fighting on a common soil. In addition, the French language has become profoundly marked in the speaking by an infiltration of the argot of the poilu. This in itself is a multifarious language, a tongue in which the simple act of going to bed may be described in more than a dozen ways, such as: "se mettre dans les plumes, se pailloter, fourrer la tête dans les tranches, se mettre dans les feuillées, mettre sa viande en torchon, etc. . . ."

I can pay no greater tribute of appreciation to the work of Dr. Swann than to urge him to undertake this new task.

HARRY KURZ

CARLETON COLLEGE

NOTES AND NEWS

Attention is drawn to the establishment of two new reviews which are to treat of French literature: *The French Quarterly*, published at Manchester, England, by G. Rudler, 61 Haverstock Hill, London, N. W. 3, and A. Terracher, 114 Bedford St., Liverpool. Books to be reviewed should be sent to 12 Line Grove, Oxford Road, Manchester. *La Minerve Française*, 1, rue de Lille. Directeur, A.-P. Garnier. Secrétaire de la Rédaction, Maurice Allem. Price, 60 francs.

The masterly study of Ferdinand Lot, *Étude sur le Lancelot en Prose*, Paris, Champion, 1918, has been awarded the Grand Prix Gobert.

The Society for American Fellowships in French Universities (Mr. I. L. Kandel, Secretary, 576 Fifth Ave., New York) has appointed for the current year eight Fellows, who will receive a stipend of one thousand dollars each.

There are this year at Indiana University three South American students, two men and one woman, who have received from the University a Scholarship that includes both free tuition and a stipend to cover expenses.

The three are: Mercedes Manosalva, Francisco Aguilera and Wenceslao Vial. The first two mentioned above have been students of Dr. J. M. Gálvez of the National University of Chile and have come to the United States to study at his instance.

Señorita Manosalva is taking Education as her major subject, while Señor Aguilera has chosen as his major subject the Spanish Language and Literature. Señor Vial is working chiefly in Political Science.

Indiana University has also a graduate Scholar from France, M. Henri L. Bourdin, who comes with free tuition and a stipend from this University and was chosen by a committee in Paris. It is the plan to offer at least one such Scholarship to a Frenchman and one to a Spanish or Spanish-American student each year.

There have been a number of appointments in Romance languages and modern languages at the University of Nebraska, where the work in these subjects has received a large extension.

Dr. Herbert H. Vaughan has been appointed professor of Romance languages, having resigned his position at the University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Jacob Warshaw has been appointed professor of modern languages. He taught for a number of years at the University of Missouri.

Mr. Clifford S. Parker and Mr. C. E. Green have been chosen assistant professors of modern languages.

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

VOL. X — OCTOBER–DECEMBER, 1919 — No. 4

THE SIÈGE DE BARBASTRE

THE *Siège de Barbastre* exists in five manuscripts and is as yet unpublisht. It numbers about 7,000 rimed Alexandrine lines, with occasional assonances. The *laisses* end with the well-known *petit vers*. The poem is ascribed to the last third of the twelfth century, and the oldest manuscripts seem to belong to the middle of the following century. Few of the unpublisht Old French epics equal the *Siège de Barbastre* in merit and charm. In view of the fact that for some time it will be impossible to publish so long a poem, it has been thought well to offer here the following passages, together with a brief narration of the events which connect them.¹

The manuscript utilized was the well-known cyclic MS., 1448, fonds français, of the Bibliothèque Nationale. It was possible for the author of this article to copy between two and three thousand lines of the *chanson* at odd moments during the tragic winter of 1917. MS. 1448 was preferred to MS. 24369, called La Vallière, because of its greater age and more distinctive character.

The *Siège de Barbastre* bears, as it were, the personal stamp of the poet, who must have been a man of ability and skill. He knew how to construct and develop a plot, and he had unusual feeling

¹ G. Paris ascribes the poem to the twelfth century: *La Littérature Française au Moyen Age*, paragaf 41 . . . Viktor Keller, *Le Siège de Barbastre und die Bearbeitung von Adenet le Roi*, Marburg, 1875, based his brief study on MS. 1448, which he had copied—with not infrequent errors, be it said. His literary appreciations are good. . . . Arthur Bovy, *Adenet le Roi et son Œuvre*, Brussels, 1889, also follows MS. 1448. He offers a much more detailed recital of the events of the *Siège* than did Keller. . . . Ph. Aug. Becker, *Der Siège de Barbastre*, in *Beiträge zur Romanischen Philologie, Festgabe für G. Gröber*, Halle, 1899, publisht a recital of the events of the poem, based on MS. 24369, an interesting article of fifteen pages.

for beauty—for flowers, music, pennons and flags, precious stones, rare stuffs, forests, rivers, helms that flash, marching armies, the hoof-beats of swift horses, the society of fair women, the sight of a distant city. He was fond of metaphors and comparisons, as will appear from the passages cited. Furthermore, he possessed a knowledge of the epic traditions of the cycle of Guillaume, and was evidently a lover of old *chansons de geste*.

A few words as to the treatment of the text. Punctuation and capitals have of course been introduced, in accordance with modern usage. Defects in grammar and orthograpy have not been remedied. I and j have been differentiated, as also u and v. The motto which determined the treatment of the text was one, which, let it be hoped, will, in some modification or other, become general: "Back to the manuscripts!" A poor manuscript is, for the purpose of the scholar, preferable to a learned restoration.

It seems wise to give *in extenso* the opening passages of the poem, as follows:

- Plaist vos oïr chanson bien faite et conpassee? (fol. 110 r^oa)
 Toute est de vielle estoire, de lonc tens pourpanseie.
 Molt fait bien a oïr, pieça ne fut contee.
 Toute est de la lignie que Dex a tant amee,
 5 De la geste Aymeri, qui proesce a duree.
 Ce fut a Pentecouste, une feste honoree.
 Li cuens fut a Nerbone, sa grant cité fondee.
 Ses filz out despartis, chascuns tint sa contree.
 N'out que Guillaume o lui a la chiere manbree,

5 Most of the names of persons are abbreviated in the MS., as is usually the case. Frequently the initial letter is alone given, with sign of abbreviation, as for *Guillaume* in line 9 and *Bovon* in l. 10. As for *Hermenjart* in the latter line, the only letters written out are the *Hr.*, but we find *H'meniart* in the nominative once. The form *Hermenjart* will be used for both the nominative and accusative, since such seems to have been the practice of the scribe for names ending in t, such as *Corsoft*, *Gerart*, *Amustant*, *Hunalt*. The author probably wrote *Guillaumes* (or *Guillelmes* of course) for the nominative, if we may trust the evidence of non-elision. There is great irregularity in the writing of the name *Bove*. The scribe writes *Bove* and *Boves* for the nominative, and *Bove*, *Boves* and *Bovon* for the accusative. In the majority of cases, the name is abbreviated. The initial A for Q of line 364 and the error in the repetition of *antor* in line 555 have been corrected: see the notes to these lines.

- 10 Bovon de Conmarcis, Hermenjart la senee.
Dont tint li cuens sa cort en sa sale pavee,
A .ccc. chevaliers a mesnie privee.
La sale fut molt bien antor ancortinee;
De jons et de mantratre et de ros fut pavee.
- 15 Les napes firent metre, cant messe fut chantee.
Aymeris sist au dois, qui proesce agree,
Et Guillaumes d'Orenges a la brace quarree.
Gerart servi au dois de la cope doree,
Et Guibelins li mendre tint la verge paree.
- 20 De mes, d'oisiaus farsis n'i ont fait demoree.
De poons ne de cines n'i out fait devisee.
Tant an done chacon, ja la cort n'iert blamee.
Après lou mangier ont la quintaine fermee.
Aymeris s'an ist feurs soz Nerbone en la pree.
- 25 La feste fut molt haute si l'ont molt honoree.
Li bordeiz commence tout aval an la pree,
Mais ans que vespre soit anclinee,
Aura mestier au plus hardi s'espee,
Car l'amirant d'Espagne a sa gent mandee,
- 30 Et l'amistant de Cordres, qui siet sor mer salee.
Bien sont xl.m. la pute gent desvee.
Si com l'amirant jure sa foi et sa pansee, (b)
Deques a Mon Lon iert s'ansaigne portee
A Saint Denis en France iert s'ansaigne portee,
- 35 Puis vendra a Nerbone, la grant cité fondee.
S'il puet prendre Aymeri, la teste aura copee.
Dame Hermenjart sera aus escuiers livree.
Je cuit ceste parole ert a neant tornee,
Ans en iert maint escut, mainte lance froee,
- 40 Maint païen jeté mort, envers, gole bace.
Ci commence chançon de bien anluminee.
D'amors et de paroles est molt bien aornee,
De grant chevalerie, s'elle vos est contee.
Se il est qui là die et elle est escoutee,
- 45 Ne cuit qu'elle vos faille de si a l'avespree.
Estraite est do lignage.

26-28 Imperfect meter has not been corrected. Part of the training of a student should be the discovery of such lines as these and the suggestion of corrections.

- Au jor de Pentecoste que vos m'oés chanter
 Tint Aymeris sa court a Nerbone sor mer.
 C. chevaliers i fist de novel adouber.
- 50 Ans n'i ot chevalier qui la volsist aler,
 Qui n'i aüst bel don, jel vos di sans fauser,
 Mantel o vair ou gris tel c'on lou volt doner.
 En après lou mangier font quintaine fermer.
 Aymeris s'en ist ferirs, et si prince et si per.
- 55 Dame Hermenjart i fait soñ pavillon porter
 Por lou chault qui fut grans qui ne pot andurer.
 Ansanble ses pucelles vait la dame joer,
 Et font ces ours betor, ces joeors taborer.
 Fierent en la quintaine cil ligier bachelier.
- 60 Mais ansois qu'il soit vespre i aura que plorer,
 Que l'amirant d'Espaigne fait sa gent asanler.
 A xl.m. les a l'an fait esmer.
 Aymeri volent prendre a Nerbone sor mer,
 Puis corront par la terre.
- 65 As pres desoz Nerbone sont François en la plaïne,
 Et Hermenjart la franche, qui out la douce alaine,
 I fist tendre son tref, ne fist pas que vilaine.
 Tout fut d'un ciglaton, n'i ot ne lin ne laine.
 Les cordes sont de soie, li païsson sont d'araine,
- 70 Et l'estache d'anmi de l'os d'une balaine.
 Honques Dex ne fist dame de maladie plaine,
 Se elle i puet dormir ne soit haligre et saine.
 D'autre part de la tente sordoït une fontaine
 Que fist par artgumant .j. roi de Bruiène. (v^aa)
- 75 La croist la mendeglore, l'ancens, la tubiène.
 Hermenjart fut antree, la franche chastelaine,
 Et si prist ses pucelles et chanta primeraine
 Con Troie fut deserte et Paris prist Elaine
 Et Menelaus ocist es pres desoz Micene.

54 Ferirs is an error for fors (or fuers or feurs). MS. 24369 has hors.

74 Artgumant: MS. 24369 has artimoire, which means magic. It would hardly do to transcribe the line: Que fist par art Gumant (or Guinant) .i. roi[s] de Bruiène, as one scholar has suggested.—Cf. Godefroy s. v. *argument*.

78 Con is written in abbreviation. Most scholars would here transcribe it com. In l. 186, the scribe wrote the word out: con.

- 80 Et nos François bohordent es pres a la quintaine,
Mais il ne vairont vespres ne la nuit primeraine
Molt auront grant paor nostre gent seignoraine,
Car l'amirant d'Espagne, li filz a l'amistaigne,
Est antrés en Gascoigne plus a d'une semaine.
- 85 Roy Yon ancontra en val de Moriaine.
.m. Gascons lor a mors et iiij.m. enmoine,
Et li rois eschapa sor .j. cheval d'Espagne.
A tant es vos .j. mes qui de l'errer se poine,
Et fut el cors navrés d'une grant lance plaine,
- 90 Si que parmi l'auberc li sens vermalz li baigne.
Sanglant est li haubers, la selle de Sartaigne.
A bon destrier corant est faillie l'alaine.
Tant l'ot lo jor coitié c'a grant dolor le moine.
Et trova nos François soz Nerbone en la plaigne.
- 95 Ja lor dira noveles de la geste grifaigne,
Des felons Sarrasins, qui Dex dont male estraine.
Or pent Dex d'Aymeri qui fist la quarentaine!
Ses pechiés pardona Marie Magdelaine,
Et gairi saint Jonas o ventre la balaine,
- 100 Car se paien l'ataingnent, ja n'istra mais de poine
A nul jor de sa vie.

- As pres desoz Nerbone sont François el sablon.
A joie bohorderent, honques n'i ot tançon.
A tant es vos Gerart, lou fil au duc Bovon.
- 105 Mist sa main a Antiaume, lo seignor d'Avignon,
Puis en a apelé Berangier et Sanson,
Huon de Morinvile et son freire Guion,
Et Jofroi l'Angevin et Hunalt lou Breton,
Savari de Cologne, Gautier de Teracon.
- 110 "Seignor, ce dist Gerart, entendés ma raisson!
Nos sires Aymeris n'a soing se de pes non.
Maldite soit Espagne, la terre Faraon,
Cant sore ne nos corent a coite d'esperon,
Que chascons poist tendre son vermail ciglaton!
- 115 Or ne seit on a dire qu' est malvais ne qui non.
Mais par la foi que doi au cors saint Simion,
Ja ne vairés .j. mois, qui c'an poist ne qui non,
Que ge cuit assaillir lou lignage Mahon!
Chascon de vos donrai o chastel ou donjon."

(b)

- 120 De cest mot s'esjoissent trestuit li danzillon,
 Mais ansois qu'il soit vespre changeront lor raisson.
 Es vos lou mes qui vient brochant a esperon,
 Et fut el cors navrés et se tient a l'arçon.
 Tant out lo jor hasté son auferrant gascon
- 125 Sanglant avoit lo cors, lo vis et lou crepon.
 Aymeris li vait contre, antre lui et Bovon.
 Gentement li demandent: "Comment as tu a non?
 Quel gent as tu trovés? Conte nos ta raisson."
 Mais cil ne lor pot dire honques ne o ne non,
- 130 Ans enbruncha lou chief si baissa lou menton.
 .IIII. fois se pasma antre les bras Guion,
 Mais li cuens lou detint.
 Li chevaliers se pasme desor son auferrant.
 Li conte l'an descendent soëf et bellement.
- 135 Au pens de lor bliauz la lou vont refroidant.
 Des pamissons revint si geta .j. plaint grant.
 Aymeris l'araisnone qui lou va molt hastant:
 "Quex gent as tu trovés? conte nos ton sanblant!"
 "Je ne puis, biaux dolz sire, car dolor ai itant.
- 140 Hons suis au roi Yon de Gascogne la grant.
 Hui matinet nos vinrent Sarrasin et Persant,
 Plus de .lx.m., par lou mien escient.
 De .xxx. chevaliers n'en ai mais nul vivant,
 Et je suis si navrés con il est aparent.
- 145 Si com l'amirant jure Mahon et Tervagant
 Nerbone cuide avoir ans l'outre jor passant."
 "Vasal, dist Aymeris, ne nos esmoiés tant!
 Li amirans se vente de folie grant.
 Ans qu'il preigne Nerbone i cuit ge faire tant
- 150 Qui n'i aura mestier li peres son anfant."

The first one hundred and fifty lines of the *Siège* suffice to show a poet accustomed to the manner of the *chansons de geste*, and who, further, seems thorolly at home in the cycle of Guillaume. He evidently knows the legend which attaches Aymeri to Narbonne, the

132 The seven-syllable short line should not end with an accented syllable, hence *detint* is an error. One could substitute *redresce*.

150 Ms. 24369 has the correct reading: *Que*.

"département" of his sons, of whom Guibelin is the youngest, the acquisition of Orange by Guillaume and, as we may infer from lines 85 and 140, that of Gascony by Bovon. If in lines 105-109 he shows no more than ordinary acquaintance with a group of lay-figures, we shall soon see that he possessed some very ancient information concerning more important heroes. In this latter regard, the poet seems not to have been unlike the author of *Foucon*, with whom he has a stylistic resemblance. That he was a fair poet is shown by such lines as 75 and 135. As for the action, it will be noticed that, as in the *Willame*, a messenger brings news of the Saracen invasion.

In the thirty-one lines which follow the above passage and which lead up to the one cited below, the action moves rapidly. The Amirant draws near with his army, and gives the order to attack. He tells his men not to kill Aymeri if they find him, but to capture him alive, so that he may be tried and condemned. Description of the arming and entrance into battle of the three hundred French knights. The brief passage which now follows is a sample of our poet's battle descriptions, in which sound is frequently mentioned (see lines 155-158, and compare the extreme of silence in lines 154-155 and 160). The word *estre* as used in line 157 is much liked by the poet. It occurs three times in this sense in the *Willame*.

- Li hardis vait son chief sor son hame baissant,
 Et pour lou mialz ferir vait sa lance baissant.
 Au coart vait li cuers soz l'aisselle faillant.
 A l'abaissier des lances sont si mu et taissant
 155 Que il n'i out ne hui ne boisine sonant.
 Plus de .lx. espiés i froissent maintenant,
 Estre lou bruit des lances dont il li avoit tant
 Et les cos des espees dont il vont chaploiant.
 Amont parmi ces hiaumes vont les grans cos donant.
 160 Li mort sont acoisié, li vif vont trebuchant.
 La poissiés veoir tant, bon dstrier corant,
 Les arçons descopés, le renes traïnant.

Aymeri's little band cannot repel the attack and are forced to

151 This passage is on fol. III r° a.

163 This passage is on fol. III r° b.

flee toward the bridge that leads to the city. Hermenjart hurries from the tent, and, as she runs, carries the train of her dress in her arms. At the bridge she is seized by some Nubians, who drag her away a prisoner. She screams for help, and calls on Aymeri and Guillaume.

- Aymeris de Nerbone entendi sa moillier.
 A haute vois escrie: "Tornés vos, chevalier!
 165 Se ge ma moillier pert, j'en aurai reprovier."
 A tant es vos Guillaume au cor neis, lou ligier,
 Boves de Conmarcis desor .j. vert destrier,
 Et Poinson et Beraut, Gaidon et Berangier,
 Et Jofroi l'angevin et Forque lou ligier,
 170 Hugue de Bargueline et lou conte Angelier,
 Savari de Tolose et lou conte Richier.
 Bien furent .iiij.c. François a l'estor commencier.
 Trestuit en vont ansamble por paiens destranchier.
 Ce jor i veïssiés tantes lances brisier.
 175 Et nos gentis François sor Sarrasins aidier,
 A destre et a senestre aus brans les rens cerchier,
 Amont parmi ces hiames ferir et chaploier,
 Ces chiés et ces viaires laidir et destranchier.
 Se il fussent ensamble .iiij.c. charpentier
 180 Que trestuit charpentassent por chastel redrecier,
 Ne feïssent il mie tel noise et tel tenpier,
 Con font nostre François por lor honte vengier.
 Apres les .iiij.c. poïst on charroier,
 A Hermenjart rescorre.
- 185 Li .iiij.c. François brochent a coite d'esperon.
 Dex! con bruient avent cil cendal et panon,
 Et les riches ansaignes de vermail ciglaton!
 Aymeris escria: "Monjoie la Karlon!",
 Et Savaris, "Tolose!", et Gautiers, "Teragon!",
- 190 Li dus Jofroi, "Valance!" fierement a haut on,
 Hunalt crie "Malo!", c'est l'ansaigne au Breton,
 Gerart et Guilins, "Conmarcis la Bovon!",
 Et li autre, "Nerbone!" tuit ansamble a haut on.

188 The scribe wrote here Klm, with sign of abbreviation above. He of course meant Karlon.

Enmi la grignor presse de la geste Mahon,

- 195 Recovrent Hermenjart, ou il veullent ou non.
Guillaumes salt a terre do destrier an sablon,
Et saissit la contesse au pan do siglaton. (v^oa)
A tant es vos poignant Berangier et Sanson.
Chascons moine .j. destrier c'ot pris d'un Esclavon.
- 200 " Seignor, ce dist Guillaumes, entendés ma raisson.
Menés an la contesse a Nerbone ou donjon.
Tos est mors et honis qui feme a au besong.
Je remenrai ici a la gent Pharaon.
Au branc forbi d'acier lor movrai tel tençon
- 205 Cui j'ataindrai a cop n'aura ja guarisson!"
Et cil ont respondu: " A Deu beneïçon!"
La contesse monterent sor .j. liart gascon.
De ci dec' a Nerbone n'i font arrestisson.
La contesse descendent sor .j. mabrin perron,
- 210 Puis repairent aier a coite d'esperon.
Ancor estoit Guillaumes a pié enz el sablon.
De toute pars li vienent li Sarrasin felon.
Plus de .lx. espiés lancierent au baron.
Ans ne porent desronpre son hauberc fremillon.
- 215 Son cheval li ocient.
- Guillaumes fut a pié desoz Nerbone es pres.
Son cheval li ont mort, si en fut molt irés.
Il a traite l'espee dont li pons fut letrés.
Cui il ataint a cop tout son tens est finés.
- 220 Aymeris de Nerbone s'est en halt escriés:
" Que faites, chevalier? Guardés ne demorés!
Guillaumes est a pié! Do secore pansés!
Sainte Marie, dame, nostre fil reclamés!
Dame, que il n'i soit ne mors ne afolés!
- 225 Roïne, se lui pert, tous suis deserités!"
Ansument con li falz qui est des poinz volez

190 Occasionally as here the scribe omits an initial consonant, when the preceding word ended in that consonant.

202, 203 Cf. *Willame*, 581-583.

226-28 MS. 24369 reads: Aussi com le faucon qui est des poinz volez De ferir ens aloës quant est entalentez, Se fiert li quens entr' euls, ne s'est asseürez.

De ferir as aloës cant est entalantés,
 Se fiert li cuens antr' ax, ne s'est asseürés.
 Et après point Gerart sor Ferrant pomelés.

- 230 Vait ferir Aquilant, .j. roi de Balegués,
 An l'escut de son col qui frais est et troés,
 Lou hauberc de son dos desrout et descerclé,
 Si que parmi lou cors li est li brans passés.
 Tant con hante li dure l'a abatu es prez,
 235 Que par terre se jut li vers hiames gemez
 Et sanglans en remeist li blans haubers saffrés.
 Il a pris lou cheval si s'en est restornés,
 Et a dit a Guillaume: "Sire honcle, car montés!"
 Et Guillaumes i monte, qui ne fut esgarés.

(b)

- 240 Adont fut li estors, la bataille es pres.
 Mais li cuens Aymeris s'est trop abandonés.
 Se cil sires n'en panse cui Dex est apelés,
 Ancui iert tex treüs aus paiens demorés
 Que jamais par nul home ne sera restorés
 245 S'an aura eü poine.

- Guillaume ont remonté, mais chier i fut vendus.
 Plus de .xx. Sarrasin i ont les chiés perdus.
 Corsolt de Tabarie vint au rens irascus.
 A .ij. de nos François i a les chiés tolus.
 250 S'ansin s'an puet aler, bien est ses los creüs.
 Plus iert antre paiens et doutés et cremus.
 Do conte Guielin fut primes parçeüs.
 Li cuens l'a si ferut de l'espié qu'est molus
 En l'escut de son col qu'il est frais et fandus.
 255 Ses haubers ne li valt une pesse de glus,
 Si que parmi lou cors li fut l'espiés cosus.
 Il ne l'a mie mors, mais il a bien ferus,
 Que par terre se geist atout son hiamé agus.
 Et Guillaumes d'Orenge, qui Dex croisse vertus,
 260 Tint l'espee o poing destre dont li brans fut fondus.

237 The verb is *trestorner*; the initial *t* was omitted because of the final *t* of *est*.

255 Instead of *pesse*, MS. 24369 has *piece*.

257 In *il a bien ferus*, the *l* does double duty: *il l'a bien f.*

Cui il consuit a cop tos est a mort ferus.
 Mais tant fut aus paiens force et pooir creüs
 Qu'illoc fut Guielin et Gerart retenus.
 Desoz Bovon fut mors ses chevaux qui ert cremus.

- 265 Aymeris s'escria, ne se tint mie mus :
 " Nerbone ! Dex, aïe ! mes filz Bove est chaüs !
 Anbedous mes nevos voi a terre abatus.
 Damedieu, sire peres, car i faite vertus,
 Que nus des .iij. n'i soit ne mors ne confondus ! "
- 270 Ansumant con li falz est es oxiaus menus,
 Se fiert li cuens antr' ax, ne fut mie esperdus.
 N'i avoit nul des contes ne fust bien securus,
 Cant l'amirant i vint, qui out molt grant vertus.
 Son maistre dragon porte, par ce fut coneüs.
- 275 El chief de nos François s'est li rois arrestus.
 Et l'amustant de Cordes est par .j. val venus.
 A .xx.M. Sarrasins est poignant acorut.
 Lors derangent ansamble, molt par fut grans li hus.
 Illoc fut Guielins et Gerart abatus,
- 280 Boves de Conmarcis a l'amirant rendus.
 Et Aymeris s'antorne. (fol. 112 r^oa)
- La ou Sarrasin pridrent Bovon de Conmarcis,
 Illoc fut retenus Gerart et Guielins,
 Savaris de Tolose et Richiers li floris
- 285 Et Hunalt de Bretagne et Jofroi l'Angevins,
 Renalt de Montamier, li proz et li gentis,
 Et Poinson et Beraut et Guaidons et Geris,
 Et avoc .c. des autres danziaus de son país.
 Et Aymeris s'antorne, corçoüs et maris :
- 290 De .xx. contes qu'il ot n'an sont remeis que .x.
 De .cc. chevaliers chascuns est si laidis
 Que tous sont destranchié les escus d'azur bis
 Et frais et enbarrés les hiames poitevins.
 Aymeris va daieres con home de halt pris.
- 295 Daiers an dos l'anchaucent .x.M. Amoravis.

264 Cremus: error for crenus.

270, 271 MS. 24369 reads: Ensement com li faus fiert es oisiaus menus, Se fiert li quens entr'euls, ne fu mie esperdus.

Dame Hermenjart s'escrie, aus murs d'araine bis,
 A sa vois haute et clere s'escria a haut cris :
 " Ha ! Guillaumes d'Orenges, que faites vos, beau filz ?
 Car secorés vos pere, ja l'auront Turc ocis !
 300 Ahi ! con estes loing, Aÿmers li chaitis,
 Guibers en dolce France au fort roi Loeïs !
 Se ge mes filz i pert et mes sire i est pris,
 Que devenirai ge, lasse ! "

Aymeris entendi sa moillier an la tor.
 305 A haute voiz escrie del mur encienor :
 " Tornés, cuens Aymeris, por Deu lou criator !
 Cant besoigne sera, si pensés do restor ! "
 Aymeris l'antendi s'an ot au cuer baudor.
 Ses conpaignons apelle si lor dist par amor :
 310 " J'ai oïe Hermenjart a la fresche color.
 Bien i devons joster une fois por s'amor ! "
 Lors derangent ensamble li gentil poigneor.
 Atant es vos Guillaume poignant a l'oriflor.
 Chascons abat lou suen envers sans nul restor.
 315 S'or eüst Aymeris lou lignage francor,
 Ja i perdissent li paien et li lor,
 Cant l'amirant i vint qui molt ot de valor,
 Et l'amustant de Cordres par .j. val tenebror,
 A .xx.m. chevaliers qui vers Deu n'ont amor.
 320 Aymeris s'antorna, qui n'ot point de sejour,
 Et a trepassé Aude lou pont major.
 Par la porte aïere reconmence l'estor.
 Cil de dedens ovrirent la porte lor seignor,
 Aymeris li hardis, que ge ne sai mellor,
 325 Et cil qui est entrés qui out au cuer dolor,
 Et an après des autres qui molt ont de valor.
 Paien et Sarrasin s'aüinent tout antor,
 Et François se retraient aus murs encienor.
 Traient abolestiers et archier tout antor
 330 Por Nerbone defandre.

(b)

As pres desoz Nerbone sont Sarrasin logiez.
 Qui dont veïst François a ces murs apoiez,
 Pour lors cors a defandre richement atiriez !
 Pierres getent aval et grans pex aguissiez.

- 335 Molt ont de Sarrasins navrés et ploïés,
Et l'amirant conmente que li murs soit brisie.
Aymeris de Nerbone, li gentis cuens prisiez,
Est montés el palais si s'est deschaubergie.
Lou hauberc c'ot vestut lait cheoir a ses piés.
- 340 Ou qu'il voit la contese ancontre s'est dreciés.
Prumerain l'apela par molt grant amistiés :
" Ahi ! gentis contesse, et car me consailliez !
Ceste cité randroie, se vos me lassiez.
Se ge mes filz i pert, jamais ne serai liez,
345 Et mes riches nevos que m'a tolut pechiez."
Cant l'antent la contesse, près n'a lo sanc changié.
Ja dira teil parole qui pas ne sera liez :
" Ahi ! Aymeris, sire, trop tost vos esmoiez !
On soloit jadis dire Aymeris iert prisiés.
- 350 Se vos ensin lou faites que la cité laissez,
Lors dira l'amperere qu'estes afoibloiez.
Alés vos en en France, la cité me laissez !
Ancor ai .iij.c. dames, bien voil que lou sachiez,
Toutes .iij.c. sont filles a chevaliers proisiez.
- 355 Sodoiers an leu d'eles por niënt queriez.
An leu de .ij. coars chevaliers me laissez.
Bien maintenrai la terre, se vo la m'otriez.
Sovent iert li estors au murs recommenciez,
Mainte pierre getee et maint espiés lanciez,
- 360 Mainte targe troée, maint hauberc demailliez.
Certes ans m'entereroient Sarrasin par les piez
Que ge la cités rande ces cuivers renoiez,
Tant con ge puisse vivre ! "

Quant Aymeris entent Hermenjart, sa moillier,

- 365 Il est passés avent si la cort embracier, (v^oa)
Puis l'a araissonée a loi de bon guerrier :
" Ahi, gentis contesse, con faites a prisier !

354, 355 Cf. *Willame*, 2447 ss. and *Aliscans*, 1947 ss.

361 The scribe is attempting to use the verb *traire*. MS. 24369 has *m'entraioient*.

364 The Ms. reads *Auant*. The A is an illuminated letter in blue, and was evidently made by a different scribe, as was often the case. By mistake, he wrote A instead of Q.

- Honques mellor de vos ne bassa chevalier !
 Certes ans me lairoie tous les manbres tranchier
 370 Que je la cité rende por ma gent mehaignier,
 Se vos et mes barnaiges voliez otrier."
 Li amirant se fait soz Nerbone logier.
 Illoc ot .j. anclos dont bel sont li vergier.
 La font lou pavillon a l'amirant drecier.
 375 En la tente vermaille se fait li rois colchier.
 Ses prisons demenda, ne li firent targier.
 Atant es vos Bovon qui molt fist a prisier,
 Gerart et Guielin es bliaut de cartier.
 Li amirant les vit ses prent a laidangier.
 380 Cil se sont en l'estor deduit con chevalier.
 Molt lor vit de lor armes nos homes domagier.
 Boves de Conmarcis an apela prumier :
 "Diva ! comment as non ? tu no me dois noier."
 Et Boves respondoit, qui molt fist a prisier :
- 385 "L'an m'apelle Bovon, ja nel vos quier noier.
 Filz suis a Aymeri, qui lou corage ait fier.
 Cil dui sont mi enfent, n'i a que corociier."
 Cant l'amirant l'antent n'i ot qu'eleescier :
 "Mahon et Apolin, toi puis ge gacier !
- 390 Mahon ferai a Mesques grant present envoier.
 Corsolt de Tabarie, toi pri que ne targier.
 Alés an son cest pui, faites forches drecier.
 Lou lignage Aymeri volrai hui abaissier.
 Jamais ne mengerai tant con soient antier !"
 395 Et cant Boves l'antent n'i ot que corociier.
 "Sarrasins, ce dist Boves, n'iés pas bien consailliez.
 N'est ancor Aymeris sain et sauf et entier ?
 Ancor a li frans cuens .vij. filz de sa moillier.
 En nulle terre au sicle ne sai tel chevalier.
- 400 Mielz vos valroit vos dois de vos paumes tranchier
 Que m'eüssiés pandut ne do cors domagié,
- 381 It seems likely that *ses* is the proper reading, instead of *nos*.
 382 The MS. has *Conmarchis*, with expunctuated *h*.
 388 The scribe wrote : *que leescier*.
 389 The scribe omitted an *r* in *gracier*.
 397 Cf. *Raoul de Cambrai*, 1847.

Tant con puissent lor armes ne lor adors baillier,
Car molt sont no parent fort et orguillox et fier,
S'anforce nos lignage!"

- 405 L'amirant ot lou conte qui contre lui contant.
De maltalant tresue, honte en ot por sa gent.
Li rois tint en sa main .j. bastoncel d'argent. (b)
Ja en ferist Bovon sans autre parlement,
Cant l'amistant de Cordres de cest cop lo defent.
- 410 "Tais, fox! ce dist li rois, tu as fol esciânt!
Cuidés por tes menaces en laissasse niënt,
Que ne te face pandre et ancroër au vent?"
"Sarrasins, dist li cuens, Dex te doint maltorment!
Con tiens or lou lignage conte Aymeri a lant,
- 415 Et lou riche secors que li bons cuens atent!
Ans que soie pandus ne ancroés au vent,
Certes vos cuit ge faire si orible et pesant
N'i volroit li mioldre estre por lor debonivant."
Cant l'antent l'amirant de maltalant esprent.
- 420 Bovon prist au bliaut si que tout lou porfant.
Adont i sont venu celle paiene gent.
Gerart et Guielin ont saissit maintenant,
Et les autres paien mainte communement.
Se dus Bove ot paor, ne m'en mervail noient,
- 425 Cant Sarrasin lou tindrent.
- Boves fut en estant entre paiens felons.
Li amirant s'escrie: "Prenés moi ces glotons!
Ancui les ferai pendre an son cest pui roont!"
"Sire, dist l'amustant, si vos plaist, nos ferons.
- 430 Dans Aymeris li cuens est de tels iroisons
S'il tenoit .j. des noz n'en prendroit reançons.
Corsolt de Tabarie lou reconmenderons,
Si lou moint en Barbastre en vos maistre maison.
Ens o fonz de la chartre metra l'an ces glotons.
- 435 Illoc les nos gart bien tant que nos i aillons.
A feste saint Jehan nos Dex aorerons.

402 The word *adors* is doubtful in the MS. M. Jean Vic has had the kindness to examine the word. He does not think *adors* correct. He considers the third letter to be undecipherable, and reads *es* for the last two letters. MS. 24369 has: Tant com puist porter armes ne monter sus destrier.

Mahon et Apolin el palais porterons.
 A vos fil, Libanor, ma fille donerons,
 Malatrie la belle, a la clere façons.

- 440 L'autrier conquist rois Karles la tor aus Esclavons.
 Nos conquerromes France, a ous la laisserons,
 Normendie et lou Moine, Angevins et Bretons,
 Chanpaigne et Loheraine et la terre au Bretons,
 Et toute la terre par dedeça les mons.
- 445 Au pui de Mon Loon coroner les ferons."
 "Sire, dist l'amirant, molt est riches cist dons.
 Grant mercis vos en rent, aorés soit Mahons!
 Faiz iert lou mariages."

In these lines occur several passages which again bear witness to the poet's fondness for rapid movement, sound, and all that relates thereto: see lines 179-187. The carpenters of these lines are certainly equal to the woodsmen of Hugo's *Mariage de Roland*: 99-101.¹ The poet twice makes use of his favorite imagery, drawn from the life of falcons. The advice given Aymeri in lines 304-307 recalls lines 619-627 of *Aliscans* and 22-36 of the *Chevalerie Vivien*. The passage where Aymeri tests Hermengart by proposing to give up Narbonne (340-371) is to be compared in all of its details with *Willame*, 1012-1033, 2445-2455; cf. also *Aliscans*, 1946-1965. The story continues as follows: The Amirant gives the prisoner into the hands of Corsolt and a guard, with orders to

440 No definite tower or fortress seems to be indicated by this line. Instead of tor, MS. 24369 reads terre.

443 This line is visibly corrupt.

¹ Much remains to be done on the MSS. of Hugo, preserved at the Bibliothèque Nationale. The MS. of the *Mariage de Roland* is especially interesting. The text as first written for lines 99-101 was as follows:

L'épée est un marteau, l'armure est une enclume;
 Le voyageur se hâte et croit voir dans la brume
 D'effrayants forgerons qui travaillent la nuit.

The lines 179-187 are to be compared with the following passage from *Gautier d'Aupois*, 10-13 (edited by E. Faral, *Classiques Français du Moyen Age*, Champion, Paris, 1919):

Se troi cent manouvrier fesoient un palais
 Et il estoient tuit de bien ouvrer entais,
 Ne menroient tel noise, ne tel cri, ne tel brais
 Comme il font sus les elmes des branz qui sont nus trais.

take them to Barbastre and put them in prison. Corsolt is then to go to Cordes and inform Malatrie that the Amirant has given her in marriage to Libanor. Corsolt is to conduct her to her father. The voyage is made in a ship. The expedition arrives at Barbastre. At this point the poet tries to arouse interest in his story by saying:

Or commence chançon mervailloxe, anforcie,
 450 Ansin con Aymeris recovra sa maisnie,
 Et Looeis li rois out la terre voidie.
 Dusc' au perron saint Jaque fut la terre essillie,
 Ans qu'il rentrast en France.

The prisoners are put into a dungeon inhabited by a terrible serpent, which attacks them. Beuve fights back with a piece of rock and a club, but nothing seems to injure the serpent. Under these distressing circumstances, Beuve thinks of his wife, Heilissant (cf. the *Narbonnais*). Fortunately for the French prisoners, the chamberlain is Clarion de Valdune, nephew of the Amirant, "et de sa seror né," who has been robbed of his inheritance and humiliated: one half of Barbastre was to have been his; he is forbidden to go farther than one league from the city. In the night he meditates on the injustice done him, thinks of the prisoners and goes to visit Beuve, carrying with him a lighted taper. Beuve sees the light, and exclaims:

"Con ceste nuit est corte! Vialt il ja esclairier?
 455 Sarrasin nos volront de la chartre gitier
 Por nos cors a destruire et batre et laidangier.
 Comment que de moi preigne, je ferai lo primier,
 Que mires ne autrui ne li aura mestier!"

Clarion takes offence at these words, but Beuve maintains his courageous attitude. They end by coming to an agreement: Beuve swears by Saint Pol d'Apolice to restore to Clarion his inheritance. In return, Clarion equips him with arms. Beuve brandishes a lance and hurls himself on the serpent, but without being able to do him

451 This passage is found on fol. 113 r° b.

454 Cf. the exclamation of Huon de Bordeaux when Esclarmonde visits him similarly: Sainte Marie! est il ore ajorné? (*Huon*, 5846). This passage is found on fol. 114 r° a.

any injury. The serpent then turns on him to devour him. Beuve plunges his lance into his throat and kills him.

As they are leaving the dungeon, the jailer (*chatremier*) awakens and attacks Beuve, who slays him. Clarion goes to liberate the other prisoners from a tower. As he enters, Savari was exclaiming:

- “Jamais ne revairons nos riche parentés,
 460 Aymeri de Nerbone, Guibert lou bachelier,
 Ne Guarin d’Anseüne, ne Hernalt lou sané,
 Ne Bernart de Brubant, ce estoit li ansnés!”
 Clarions lor a dit: “Car vos reconfortés!
 Que faites vos, François? Por coi vos arrestés?
 465 Ja vos mande dus Boves que vos lou secorés.
 Je ai lui et ses filz de la prison getés.”
 “Vasal, dist Savaris, por coi nos degabés?
 Car pleüst or a Deu, lo roi de majestés,
 Que ge fusse lajus les Bovon a cotés,
 470 Et tenisse en mon poing mon branc d’acier letré!
 Ans i ferroie tant lou bras auroie anflé,
 Ansois que par paiens i fusse anprisonés!”

Clarion gives some of them arms, others possess themselves of those belonging to the jailer. The Amoravi, however, has been awakened by the noise. Search is made for the marauders, they are discovered, and the Amoravi menaces them with death. Sword in hand, he attacks Beuve, who kills him. *Mêlée*. Corsolt escapes from the palace, and gives the alarm. Clarion tells the Frenchmen of the great age of the tower in which they are besieged:

- Rois Julius Cesaires la fist par amistés.
 Tous li pires carrel est a cissel ovrés,
 475 A metal ou a plom bien assis et fondés.

The attack on the tower begins “endroit ore de prime,” and proves unsuccessful. The defenders throw down on the assailants the bodies of the Saracens they have killed. The attack at last ceases. Beuve makes a sortie with eighty armed men. They bring

459 This passage is found on fol. 114 v° a.

in a hundred prisoners, men of importance, whom Clarion reminds of their injustice toward him. Among the Christians is a chaplain, who baptizes the prisoners. Clarion sets them an example by being baptized first:

Trois fois i est plongié volantiers et de gré,
 Et li autre paien, n'en i est .j. remeis.
 Li un an sont por Deu baptisié et levé,
 Que mialz aiment la loi que la premiere assés.
 480 Li autre si lou firent anviz, c'est verités,
 Mais tant fort redoutoient Bovon et son barné.

Clarion suggests that it will be well to search the palace. Not many Saracens are discovered, but twenty are captured who are said to be black: "n'ont que blans les dens."¹ These prisoners are brought before Beuve, who later gives them their choice between baptism and death. They choose the former. Clarion conducts the French knights to the *mahomerie*, which is described as follows:

Molt iert belle la chanbre, noble, de grant richor.
 Soz ciel n'a home qui ans veïst meillor.
 Li oisel i sont point si con volant lou jor,
 485 Ansin con li plus grant fait guerre lou menor,
 Et les bestes sont pointes an halt en l'autre tor,
 Ansin con paise l'erbe la nuit a la froidor.
 Les pieres qui assisses sont an l'orle major
 N'esligeroient mie dui riche anpereör.
 490 Leans iert Mahomés asis en .j. destor,
 A tous les .ij. paiens a mervaillose honor,
 Qui tant servent et aiment Mahon a grant honor.
 Et Mahons est entr' ox en l'estage major,
 Sor .j. faudesteul d'or, honques ne vi grignor.
 495 Les pieres qui i erent do tresor l'aumaçor,
 Nes eligast por voir ne roi n'enpereör.

¹ One could cite a number of passages which offer this picturesque detail; cf. *Conquête de Jérusalem*, published by Hippeau, where it is said of the warriors of Bocidant (lines 7511, 7512):

Plus sont noir c'arremens (a malfés les commant!)
 Et n'ont de blanc sor aus mais que l'oïl et la dent.

476 This passage is found on fol. 115 v° a.

482 This passage is found on fol. 116 r° b.

Et Mahons se sist sus con hons de grant fieror.
 .XX. cierges i ardoient, qui getent grant luor
 Par trestoute la chanbre.

- 500 Richement fut assisse l'image de Mahon. (fol. 116 v^oa)
 Sor .j. faudesteul d'or, si riche ne vit on.
 Tuit li dui Sarrasin li erent environ,
 De fin or tout marsis do chief dec' au talon.
 Bien vos sai aconter .j. poi de sa façon.
 505 .X. piés out bien de grant, que de fi lou seit on.
 .I. pié antre dous iolz, la barbe noire an son.
 Larges ert par espaule et gros par lou crepon.
 L'anforcheüre ot longe, bien resanble Breton.
 Et François lo regardent, ne dient o ne non.

It is proposed by Clarion that they break to pieces the statue of Mohammed. No sooner said than done. The precious stones will be presented to Beuve. They discover Ferrant, the horse of Gerart, which the enemy had been glad to keep.

Corsolt escapes from Barbastre to carry the news to the Amirant. Here a brief passage is cited for the sake of the geographical names:

- 510 Corsolt de Tabarie est de Barbastre enblés
 Sor .j. blanc dromadaire qui n'estoit pas lassés.
 Passe Rune et Serine, les pors de Balegués,
 Et costoit Leride et Cordres de delés,
 Et est venus a Aude, dont parfont est li gués.

- 515 Ja dira sa nouvelle.

Corsolt announces the loss of Barbastre and the betrayal of Clarion. The Amirant expresses his opinion of Beuve, whom he calls *puinart*. The Amustant, who is present, advises him to abandon the siege of Narbonne and attack Barbastre. The two chiefs embark. Hermenjart, who has arisen early and gone to look

508 Ms. 24369 has bricon.

510 This passage begins on fol. 117 r^o a.

512 According to A. Thomas, Runa is a name for the Arga, which flows by Pampelune: voir Fita and Vinson, *Codex de St.-Jean de Compostelle*, p. 8, and *Romania*, XI, p. 499, note 4. Serine is perhaps the Serinde of the *Roland*.

down from the walls of the city, sees them. Her only thought is that they are carrying away her son, Beuve, for she of course does not know that he had been sent to Barbastre. The Saracen army casts anchor in the port of Barancon, whence it starts for Barbastre. At the moment when it is drawing near to the city, Beuve and a group of his men have gone outside the walls and are looking at the broad waters of the Sore, the plowed fields, the vineyards and the meadows. Beuve is raptured, and says to Gerart :

- “ Molt est ceste cités menant et asazee,
Et qui or si l'auroit lealment conquestee
Par lui seroit ancor Espagne delivree.”
Et regarda aval lou fons d'une valee,
520 Voit venir Sarrasins et lor compaigne armee,
Qui ans ainz, qui miolz miolz, tout a une aünee.
Dex ! tante riche ansaigne i ot lo jor mostree,
Et tant cheval inel qui out selle doree !
Gerart son fil apelle, si li dist sans celee :
525 “ Veez ici, beaus filz, molt tres male aünee.
Ce n'est pas Looys ne gent de ma contreee.”
“ Non, voir, ce dist Gerart, ens est gent defaece.
Bien conois cest dragon a la gole bace !
Il estoit soz Nerbone cant fui pris en la preee.
- 530 C'est li amirant et grant ost assanblee ! ”
“ Voire voir, ce dist Boves, mar fust elle honques nee !
Que diable lor ont la nouvelle contee
Ensin tost a Nerbone ? ”

Beuve gives the order to return to the city without fighting: his plan is to send for aid to his brothers and Louis. But the temptation is too great for the young and eager Gerart. He rides to attack the enemy, and is joined by five hundred of his countrymen. The Saracens yield, but, reinforced, turn about and pursue the French, who have started back to the city. The mêlée centers for a while around Guielin, who is rescued by Gerart. The two brothers are soon separated. A band of Nubians throws itself on Gerart,

516 This passage is found on fol. 117 v° a.

526, 529 The error in the last words of these lines was due to the hasty abbreviation. Only a few lines previously, the scribe wrote *pree*.

who is knocked from his horse: "La force paist lou pré, li dus Gerart chaï." Fortunately, Clarion comes riding out of the city with reinforcements. The Saracens recognize the traitor to their cause, and receive orders to capture him, but Guielin, Beuve, Jofroi, Hunalt, Navari and the others join in the mêlée, and the enemy soon begins to retire. Gerart has by this time been rescued, and is again taking part in the battle.

A Turk "de Balesgués" recognizes Clarion and insults him. Duel, in which both men are unhorsed. The Turk is saved by his men, Clarion by Gerart. The Amirant now enters the battle, meets Beuve and each inquires the other's name. Duel. The Amirant falls to the earth stunned, but some of his men carry him away, while others surround Beuve, whose resistance would have been vain, were it not for the arrival of his sons and Clarion. Tableau: Guielin seizes the reins of his father's horse and leads it, while Gerart places himself behind him; in this way, they get him into the city.

The Saracen host blockades the city. The Amirant, who calls himself the lord of Spain, pitches his tent at the end of the bridge. Orders are given to bleed and shoe the horses. Images of Mahon, Tervagant, Apolin, Cahu and Jupiter are set up in the *mahomerie*. The Amustant sends messengers to his daughter, Malatrie, telling her to come with an army to Barbastre. They find her seated with her maids under a sycamore (*sicamor*). She inquires news of the siege of Narbonne, and learns that her people will probably never capture it. Relation of the events at Barbastre, of the heroism of Beuve, Gerart and Guielin. Malatrie hears with pleasure that the French are that sort of warriors, and begins to feel such an interest in Gerart that she is displeased when informed that her father intends to marry her to Libanor, the son of the Amirant.

But her father has ordered her to levy an army and come to Barbastre, which will bring her near the scene of great exploits. She obeys:

La pucelle se dresce o lou viaire cler.

Elle vit devant lui Galaciel ester.

535 N'ot que .iij. piés de lonc, mais si tost puet aler

533 This passage is found on fol. 120 r° a.

Plus coroit que lion, ne leupart ne sangler.
La belle Malatrie l'an prist a apeler.

She sends Galaciel to Loquiferne for the army. Her glance then falls on young Malaquin de Sulie, whom she orders to be armed a knight. Preparations for departure. Description of her ship:

- La nef a la pucelle firent aparaillier.
Honques ne fut si riche, sou ai oï tesmoignier.
540 La barge au roi Judas n'i valsist .j. denier,
La Seguin de Bordelle et lou dromont Fochier,
Que elle out de lonc lou trait a .j. archier.
Chambres i ot ou l'an pot donoier,
Et la mahomerie et molins et vivier,
545 Lou four por lou pain cuire et lo vin ocelier.
.IIII. mals i ot hals por la voille drecier,
La ou li vens se fiert por lo mialz a nagier.
A l'un bort de la nef out .j. praelet chier.
Malatrie s'i vait sovent esbanoier,
550 Aus eschas et aus tables por son cors deporter. (fol. 120 v^a)
Cil qui sot de la nef sout molt de son mestier,
Par tel angin qu'elle ne pout plungier.
.IIII. chastés out fait por la nef esforcier.
A chascon des chastels out .xx. arbolestriers,
555 Et au bors tout antor furent li chevaliers.
Delés aus ont lor armes, qui molt sont a prisier,
Por lou dromont defandre, se il en ont mestier,
Qui tant par estoit riches.

Malatrie is accompanied by many beautiful ladies and noble knights. The ship arrives at Barbastre:

- Molt demoinent grant joie cant ont terre saisie
560 De tabors et de fibres i ot grant tabornie,
Et herpes et vielles, guiges et estrumie.
Estaives et flagex sonent par aramie.
Mais ansin con la rose cant elle est espanie

538 This passage is found on fol. 120 r^o b.

555 Thru error the word antor is repeated.

559 This passage is found on fol. 120 v^o a.

Est dejoste jenestre o dejoste l'ortrie,
 565 Ansin con elle est plus et belle et signorie
 Est desor ses pucelles plus belle Malatrie.

The Amirant welcomes Malatrie, and offers her Libanor, his son, as her husband. She finds a way to evade a reply. It is announced that this prince is going to arrive. He comes, and the Amustant presents him to his daughter:

"Fille, veez ci lo roi que vos aurois a per.
 Hainalt et Normendie averois a garder,
 Et la moitié d'Espagne vos ferai delivrer.
 570 A pui de Monloon vos ferai coroner,
 A saint Denis en France la corone porter."

She thanks her father. Libanor expresses his pleasure at the marriage. She says that she hopes to see him perform deeds of prowess under the walls of the city. He is indiscreet enough to boast of what he will do at dawn the next morning. Her father asks where she wants her tent placed, and she says:

"Beyond the bridge, where the water of the spring runs so gayly." Her father makes the objection that the French might molest her, but she suggests that he confide her to the guard of Libanor, who can establish his quarters near her tent. Description of the spring: the fortune of Desier would not suffice to pay for its value; two hundred knights could find room on its banks to sit down and eat. Description of the fountain and of the tent of Malatrie:

Le tref a la pucelle tudent les l'ovier,
 A ruit de la fontaine, par delés lou gravier.
 Honques en nulle terre ne vit nus hons plus chier,
 575 Ne mellor ne plus gent por son cors aaisier.
 Tant par est biaux et riches que lou pior quartier
 N'esligessiés vos mie por l'avoir Desier,
 Et tant iert grans et larges que .cc. chevalier
 I poissent antor aseoir au mengier.
 580 Icelui qui lou fist lou sot bien entaillier.
 Por noient queroit on el mont mellor ovrier,
 Que nus hons ne poroit son parail enginnier.

567 This passage is found on fol. 121 r° a.

572 This passage is found on fol. 121 r° b. The last word in this line is an error for olivier.

Desoz iert a gerons, desus iert a quartiers.
Sor la feste avoit .j. aigle d'or d'or mier,

- 585 Qui reluist et resplant con charbons en brassier.
Les cordes sont de soie, li paisson d'alier,
Qui retienent lou tref qu'il ne puet trebuchier.
Les ovres qui ens ierent font forment a prisier.
Toute l'ovre si estoit o d'argent ou d'or mier.
- 590 Plain sont de l'une part dames et chevalier,
Si con chascon velt miolz sa besogne exploitier.
D'autre part les pucelles et li franc escuier,
Qui desirent et veullent lor amis a baissier.
Sos ciel n'a home qui lou poïst prisier,
- 595 La beauté, la richesce, ne lou tref eligier.
Sor .ij. cotes de paille, qui molt font a proisier, (fol. 121 v^oa)
Au chief li sont possé .ij. molt riche oraillier;
Malatrie la gente se vait dedens couchier.
Tuit sont de fine soie, tregité a or mier.
- 600 Que qui ait reposé, ans n'i pout somaillier,
Car trop panse a la joste Libanor lou guerrier.
Cant reposer n'i pot, prist li a enuier.
Au matin par son l'aube se fist aparaillier,
Et vesti an son dos .j. bliaut d'inde chier.
- 605 A son col afubla .j. mantel de cartier.
La pane en iert plus blanche que n'est flor d'esglantier.
Il n'estoit pas d'ermine, bien lo puis afichier,
Mais d'une beste estrange qui nest en son renier.
Desor son chief a mis .j. chapel d'olivier.
- 610 La grant beauté de li vos voil ge acointier.
Les chavox out luissans plus que né sor gravier;
Les iolz ot vairs et biaux plus que falcons muer;
La color de sa face passe flor d'aiglantier;
La bouchete espessete molt belle por baissier;
- 615 Et si l'out vermaillete por lo miolz entouchier;
Les mameletes dures con pomes de pomier;
La hanchete bassete, gente por manioier

584 The scribe wrote: dormier.

609 Ms. 24369 has aiglantier.

613 Ms. 24369 has rosier.

De plus gente pucelle n'oïstes ans plaidier,
S'elle creïst an Deu, qui tot a a jugier.

She intends to take an early morning ride. Description of the precious saddle, with its stirrups of gold. She mounts her mule and starts to ride along the bank of the Sore. She sees there Libanor, who is having himself dressed and armed. He asks her to wait for him, so that he may protect her. He orders his men not to come to his aid if he is attacked by as few as three enemies. The two ride away, he holding the reins of her mule. They cross the bridge, which seems to indicate that their tents were pitched on the farther side of the river from Barbastre, and dismount under an olive tree. Libanor sticks his lance into the earth, and lets his pennon fly in the breeze.

Gerart has arisen early. From the windows he hears the birds sing, sees the dew fall and the day dawn, and perceives the group under the olive tree and the silken flag. He slips noiselessly thru the room where Beuve lies asleep by the light of two burning tapers, hurries down and orders Ferrant to be saddled. He tells his men that he is going to ride around the walls of the city, and asks Gautier le Tolosant to open for him the *porte terrine*. Gautier at first refuses, for Beuve had given orders that no one was to go out of the fortress. Gerart threatens Gautier with his sword, and is allowed to go out:

620 Gerart ist de Barbastre sor lou cheval armé,
Mais il ne s'en va mie con vilains esgarés,
Mais les galos, molt richement conraez,
Les janbes portes droites, les piés amoncelés,
Et s'ot blons les chavox, menus recerçelés,

625 Et les iolz vairs et gros conme falcons mués.
Cant lou vit Malatrie, a son dru l'a mostré:
"Or en voi .j. issir qui molt est biaux armés!
Tous sols s'en est issus, de bien faire abrivés.
Mahons! con il est biax, cortois et acesmés!

630 Con li siet cil haubers et cil hiaumes gemés!
Li escus a son col, com s'il li ert plantés!

620 This passage is found on fol. 122 r° b.

623 Ms. 24369 has: porte droites, les piez ot encavez.

- Ves quele enforcheüre, quel cors de bacheler !
 Con lie la pucelle de cui il iert privés !
 Jamais ne li seroit paradis desirrés.
 635 Por Mahon ! quel destrier ! con il vient abrivés !
 Con porte de sos lui ses piés amoncelés ! (fol. 122 v^o a)
 C'est avis que il vole con oixias enpanés."

Libanor boasts that he will capture the young knight, and begs of Malatrie a kiss before leaving her. She promises it to him, and even a second one, if he returns a victor. Her gallant suitor laughs as he mounts his horse, and rides rapidly to meet Gerart. Each adversary inquires the other's name. Libanor urges Gerart to become a Mussulman, promising him a crown and his niece, the daughter of Rubion. Gerart refuses and insults the saracen deities. He invites Libanor to cease talking and ride forward, for he, Gerart, is going to win the fair maid and carry her off. Duel. Gerart ends by striking Libanor so violently that his surcingle breaks, and the rider falls and slips into the shallow water of the Sore. He does not dare to come to land. Gerart conducts himself generously in not trying to harm him further, seizes by the rein the beautiful horse of his rival, and rides toward Malatrie, whom he salutes politely, addressing her in *grigois*:

- "Cest cheval vos present, ou il n'a point de selle.
 C'est de par Libanor, l'amirant de Tudelle.
 640 Vez lou lai ou se baigne delés Sore la belle,
 Por lo chalt qui est grans do solail qui l'apresse.
 Car li alés aidier, s'il vos plaist, dameiselle !
 Sol est descendus, n'a vasal qui lou serve."
 "Trop vos poés prisier, vasal, dist la pucelle.
 645 Un des mellors d'Espagne nos avés mis a terre.
 Car me dites vos non, chevalier debonaire,
 Que lou resache dire a l'amirant de Perse?"

Gerart accedes to her request, and dazzles her with the mention of some of the famous members of his family:

- Cant Malatrie l'ot, sel saissit par la rene.
 "Gerart, car m'enportés, frans hons de bone geste !
 650 Por la vostre amistié querrai lo roi celestre.

638 This passage is found on fol. 123 r^o a.

Se me poés avoir laissus el plus halt estre, (fol. 123 r^{ob})
 De .xxv. cités suis preste que vos serve.
 Aise et Aufrique aurois et trestoute la terre,
 Pise et Puille et Candie et lou mont de Pinelle,
 655 Et s'aurés en demoine les tors de Loquiferne.
 Riche corone d'or en aurés en vo teste."

This golden prospect and the beautiful princess are enough to decide Gerart, who accepts with joy, saying: "Qui vos i velt laisser il n'a droit en pucelle!" He helps her to mount her mule, and they ride off towards Barbastre, he leading by the rein the captured horse. The inevitable Saracens now appear, Corsolt in the vanguard. He comes upon Libanor, who tells him what Gerart is doing. Corsolt hurries off in pursuit.

Gautier le Tolosant looks down from the walls and sees the danger of him whom he calls his *seignor*. He arouses Beuve. Everyone arms himself. The great door is opened, fortunately for Gerart, who is hard pressed by the enemy. Corsolt gives orders for his capture, and says that they will bury him up to the waist in manure in front of the fortress gate: "A vo teste traïront nostre mellor archier." Gerart asks Malatrie to lead the captured horse, turns back and fights with Corsolt, whom he unhorses. But in the mean time a thousand Saracens have rushed in between him and Malatrie. He is surrounded, and strikes right and left like a madman, crying: "Monjoie!" At this moment, his friends dash out of the door, uttering their war-cries. Mêlée, in which Gui and his brother Gerart perform prodigies. Beuve gathers his men about him and proposes that they return to the city: "Puisque ge ai Gerart, je ai bien tout trové." The Amirant and the Amustant are coming; the Saracens hustle the Christians back to the door:

Desi que a Barbastre ont après ous alé,
 En la porte s'an sont pelle et melle entré.

Gautier lets the portcullis fall, and three score or more of the enemy are caught and put to death. The Saracen chiefs ride away disappointed.

Beuve scolds Gerart for his disobedience, but becomes mollified when his son relates how he unhorsed Libanor and captured Mala-

trie and her mule. Beuve applauds his prowess and bids him bring forth the princess. When Gerart admits that the enemy recaptured her, his father gives way to his anger, but Gerart declares that no one in France, not even his father, could have done better, whereupon Beuve upbraids him:

- “He glos! ce dist li dus, con tu es enplaidiés!
 660 Ja fui ge a Conmarcis de paiens assigniés.
 .X. rois i out paiens dont ge fui assigniés.
 Je combati tos sols a .iiij. renoiés.
 Les .ij. getai tos mors, les .ij. menai liés.
 Des .ij. que ge pris ai fui ge si bien paiés,
 665 Que g'en ai de fin or .x. somiers tos chargiés.
 Tant en donai mes homes que chascun fut tos liés,
 Et si en sui plus d'aus servis et esauciés.
 Jes conquis par mes armes.”
- “Sire, ce dist Gerart, bien vos savés prisier.
 670 Se vos vos combatites au branc forbi d'acier,
 Vos gens vos ierent pres plus de .iiij. milier,
 Et si aviez .iiij.c. abolestriers,
 Qui trestos se penoient de vos vie eloingnier.
 De trestoutes les pars traioient vostre archier.
 675 Se vostre gent veissent qu'en eüssiés mestier,
 Si vos eüssent tost secorut et aidié. (fol. 125 r^a)
 Vos n'i peüssiés perdre la monte d'un denier,
 Mais ge uissit tos sous, armé sor mon destrier.
 Mais c'est us et costume a villart chevalier
 680 Volent as jones homes et noter et tencier.
 Cant il voient bien faire .j. jone chevalier,
 Qui est pros et herdis en grant estor plenier,
 A poines en dit bien li villars chevalier:
 Ja ne voldroit li violz lou jone home essaucier.
 685 Tex se vente sovent qui ne valt .j. denier.”
 Cant li dus l'antendi, lou sanc cuide changier.
 Garde, vit a la terre .j. baston de mellier.
 Au pouns destre lou prist dus Bove lou guerrier.
 Volt en ferir Gerart parmi lou henapier,
 690 Cant des pouns li osterent li baron chevalier.

659 This passage is found on fol. 124 v^o b.

678 The t of uissit is probably due to the following t.

They lead Gerart away, and Guielin reproves him for having angered their father.

The story returns to the Saracen camp. The Amustant uses violent language to his daughter, who defends herself by relating how Libanor had conducted her to see the duel between him and a French knight. Libanor, she says, had left her to go and take a bath with his armor on; meanwhile his adversary had led her away a prisoner. In spite of herself, she would have been obliged to become a Christian. A fine marriage and a fine husband her father had proposed for her! The Amustant is angered, and has her conducted out. Her maids are with her, and would be glad to serve her. She feels the need of talking with someone to whom she can tell everything. She calls for Malaquin, a Saracen who had been *chanbelan*. They come to an understanding. On her promise to have his estates and inheritance restored to him, he agrees to go and invite Gerart to come and speak with her in secret, and to bring with him five of his friends, whom she names. Malaquin succeeds in crossing the Sore at a ford, and is finally admitted to Barbastre to deliver a message to Gerart. The messenger does as he had promised, and adds a perhaps needless description of the physical charms of Malatrie. Gerart withdraws a moment to consult Gui, who advises him to go to the rendezvous, but to conceal a hundred armed men in a nearby wood. Gui will be one of the hundred, and will send with his brother, in his stead, Renalt de Montamier: "Cil saura plus de moi por pucelle baissier." Gerart accepts, therefore, the rendezvous, and, in company with his five friends and the hundred men, slips noiselessly out of the city in order not to attract the attention of Beuve. They cross at the ford. The hundred men conceal themselves. It is night. Malatrie and her maids have left their tents. She sees in the darkness the gleam of the gemmed helmets and the shields set with gold. Malaquin points out to her Gerart:

Cant lo voit Malatrie li cuers li est levés.
Venue est a Gerart tot contreval les prés.
Desus ses garnemens l'acola molt soëf.

"Gerart, dist Malatrie, ami, car m'atendés!
695 Veez ci quanque j'ai vos est abandonnés.

691 This passage begins on fol. 126 v° a.

- Mon cors et mon avoir et canque j'ai, prenés !"
 " Belle, ce dist Gerart, certes bien dit avés !
 La nuis iert bien alee, ja iert jors ajornés.
 Montés devient moi, dame, bien tost, se volés !
 700 Chascons prendra la soë de saus que vos veez.
 S'or estoie en Barbastre o vos .v. restornés,
 La feroie, ma dame, toutes vos volantés."
 " Gerart, dist Malatrie, de folie parlés !
 Cuidiés m'en vos porter ansin con vos oés ? (b)
 705 Conme feme robee ja ne m'en porterés !
 Gerart, gentis et nobles, ne vos desesperés !
 La nuit est grant et longe, molt bien vos deportés.
 Enuit mais dec 'au jor o nos demorerés.
 Puis que vos m'avés, sire, nulle autre ne querés.
 710 Je suis fille de roi si ai grans iretés,
 Et ves ci mes pucelles qui molt ont de beautés.
 Chascune aura son dru, se vos ne m'en fausés,
 Lajus en cel vergier, joste cel breul ramé.
 Certes je lor promis desque fustes mandés.
 715 Sofrés que mes dis soit vers elles aquités."

What does Gerart do, except to yield? He does so with the rashness of youth :

- Gerart descendit jus do destrier auferrant,
 Et saissit la pucelle au gent cors avenant.
 Main a main s'en antrerent ou vergier verdoiant,
 Et li autre baron ne se vont atargent :
 720 An prist chascons la soë premerains en estant,
 Par lo vergier s'an vont andui esbanoiant,
 .II. et .ij. vont ensamble grant joie demenant.
 Gerart et Malatrie sont d'une part tornant.
 Sos .j. pin sont assis, estroit se vont baissant,
 725 Par lou jardin s'an vont endui entracollant.
 Malaquin de Viene qui lou cors out vaillant,
 Por les chevaus garder remest hors en estant,
 Et cil sont o vergier qui tout font lor talant
 D'acoler, de baissier, si com ge truis lisant.
 730 De terres alianes ne vont pas devissant.

730 This poetic line is to be compared with the more ordinary one of *Raoul*, 5678: " Il n'ont or cure d'autres bles gaaignier."

- Ne vos sauroie a dire en trestot mon vivant!
 Gerart sist o vergier qui lou cuer ot joiant,
 Joste lui Malatrie au gent cors avenant.
 Bel et cortoisement se vont entracointant.
- 735 "Damoixias debonaires, entendés mon sanblant!
 Car desarmés vos chief, s'il vos vient a talant,
 Car honques ne vos vi tot desarmé noiant."
 "Belle," ce dist Gerart, "tout a vostre comment!
 Conmander me poés con a vostre sergent."
- 740 Il osta son vert hame et la coife tenant.
 Malatrie l'esgarde bellement en riant, (fol. 127 *ra*)
 Et Gerart l'anbraça par les flans maintenant.
 Plus de .xx. fois la besse en .j. tenant,
 El menton, en la face, qu'elle avoit bel et gent.
- 745 Pour sou qu'elle est paiene va sa bouche eschivant.
 Tant deloie Gerars que pres fut d'ajornant.

The charming idyl is interrupted. The night-guard of the Saracens, with Corsolt in charge, is returning toward dawn, and rides thru the little wood where the hundred knights are in ambush. The Saracens perceive them with joy, and, as the poet says of them: "Il ulent et glatissent et moient grant revel." Gui and his men rush to attack them. Battle. Gui sounds his horn to encourage his troop. Gerart hears the horn, leaps to his feet and accuses Malatrie of having betrayed him. He and his five companions arm themselves and take leave of their "sweethearts," and ride away, guided by Malaquin. Without warning, they fall upon the enemy, crying: "Monjoie!" Corsolt thinks that ten thousand French are coming, and starts to return to camp and safety. He meets Malatrie and her maids, and undergoes the humiliation of her irony: "Cil cheval ou seez set molt bien lou sentier!" The Amirant, informed by Corsolt of what has happened, insults his gods in the usual manner, and then says:

- "Ja ne sont il leans en cel palais mabrin
 Que .c. chaitif de France, qui sont pauvre et frarin,
 Et .c. paien qui ont renoié Apolin.
- 750 Poor avés eü, Corsols, sire cosin,
 Ou vos avés songié ou parlé au devin."

A Saracen, terribly wounded, arrives and declares that Malatrie

does not care a *romoisin* for her father, and that she invited Gerart to come and see her. The Amirant asks his son Libanor to avenge his people and to bring in prisoner Gerart and Gui. All seize their arms.

Meanwhile the French knights begin to ride away toward the ford.¹ The Saracens push them hard. Gerart encourages his men:

- " Bien savés qu'Aymeris o lou grenon mellés
 Ne volt honques estre en chanbre enserrés,
 Mais an dure baitaille adès estre mellés.
 755 De ce est ses lignages tos jors an erités.
 Et Dex me laist tenir par la soë bontés
 A lignage lou conte qui bien est esprovés! "
- " Sire, ce a dit Guis, bien estes escolés!
 Certes, molt bons clers estes et molt bien enparlés!
 760 Se vos sermonés longues, tos nos convertirés.
 Ves ci les Sarrasins o les crestienés.
 Je lor donrai batesme au branc qui est letrés,
 Et vos a vostre espee lou cresse lor donés."
 Lors derangent François conme falz enpenés.
 765 Ja eüssent paiens mors et debaretés,
 Cant li rois Libanors en est issus des tres.

The French are driven back, and many of them are killed, among others Renalt, Guinement and Fouqueré. Guielin laments the dead, and regrets that he has no messenger to send to his father. At this moment, says the poet, God performed a miracle: Beuve, who is asleep, has a vision; he is pursuing a wild-boar, when a lion appears and grabs him by his right arm. He awakens with such a start that the bed gives way, its *chevilles* having snapped. In response to his cries, the *chambrelains* hurry to him, and receive orders

¹ Three interesting lines occur here:

Et nos François s'an torment et rengié et serré.
 Se eüssiés .j. gant ancontremont getés,
 Ansois eüssiés une traitie alez.

The conclusion of the sentence is lacking in our MS. Cf. the famous passage of *Raoul de Cambrai*, 2412-14.

752 This passage is found on fol. 128 r° b.

752 The proper name in this line is abbreviated thus: Ay., and can be read Aymers or Aymeris. Because of *mellés*, the latter form has been adopted, tho the data given recall the legend concerning Aymer.

to summon his sons and his chaplain, Renier, "qui est de bon es-cient." He expects him to explain his dream. On learning that Gerart and Gui have gone secretly to see Malatrie, Beuve leaps out of bed, arms himself and winds his horn of ivory. He and his men leave the city. Libanor and the Saracens retire, pursued by the French, who slay many enemies.

Malatrie and ten of her maids come out of their tents in time to see pass the rout of the Saracens. Malaquin tells them the names of the victorious heroes, assures Malatrie that she shall have Gerart, the sister of the Amirant, Gui, the daughter of the Aupatri, Hunalt, the daughter of Solas, Savari, and the daughter of the Amargaris, Joffroi. Beuve comes riding rapidly. Malatrie makes a pretence of trying to return to the tents, but Beuve bars the way and inquires her name. He sends his rich captive under guard to the city.

The Amustant and the Amirant now enter the battle. Mêlée at the moats and gate. Many Saracens force their way into the city, but they are caught, for Gautier lets down the portcullis. Gui and Hunalt, however, have been left outside. Just as Gui is about to enter at the postern gate, he hears the reproach of Hunalt, who has been beaten from his horse:

"Que pora ore dire Aymeris a vis fier,
Et Hermengart, ma dame, qui tant fait a prisier?
Filz suis de sa seror; bien me devés aidier!"

Gui, of course, returns. He succeeds in saving his cousin, but is taken prisoner and brought before the Amirant. They take away his sword and remove his hauberk:

770 Guis remest sanglés el bliaut ciglaton.

Molt estoit bias et gens de cors et de façon.
La bouche out bien seant par desos lou menton.
L'amirant l'esgarde antor et environ,
Et dist aus Sarrasins: "Or esgardés, baron!"

775 Cil sanble do parage Aÿmer, lou felon,
C'on apelle chaitif en tante region."

767 This passage is found on fol. 129 r° b.

770 This passage is found on fol. 129 v° a.

The Amirant inquires his name. Gui does not conceal it, and profits by the occasion to mention all his uncles, except Aymer. The Amirant replies by saying that he will have him hanged, if Barbastre is not surrendered. Gui throws himself at his feet, begs that he wait until the morrow and suggests that he then have a great fire made before the walls of Barbastre in which to burn him, in case his father refuses to give up the city. The Amirant accedes to the request. The fire is built the next morning, and from the walls Beuve and some companions see and understand. Gerart and others slip out of the city by the *porte turcoise*, make a detour, dismount from their horses, and approach in a way to make the Saracens think them to be merchants. At the right moment, they mount and attack. Beuve and a band of the new converts rush out of the city and assist them. Gui is rescued, and the enemy retires. Malatrie is duly impressed with the courage of Gerart, who has saved his brother. Beuve decides that it is his duty to send to Louis and Aymeri for aid. The passages that follow are the most important in the *Siège de Barbastre*.

RAYMOND WEEKS

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

(*To be continued*)

VAIR AND RELATED WORDS: A STUDY IN SEMANTICS

THE Old French word *vair* first came to my attention several years ago in connection with Chaucer's translation of *Le Roman de la Rose*, where Ydelnesse is described as having

yën greye as a faucon (Frag. A, 546).

Happening to know that falcons, and indeed all of the family *Falconidae*, have eyes within the ranges of red and yellow, mostly with decided chromatic effect wholly different from our idea of grey,¹ I became curious to know the origin of the expression and its history. We hear of a "Goshawk glance" in Scott's *Heart of Midlothian*; and Tennyson, in *The Princess*, describes the lady Psyche as:

A quick brunette, well moulded, falcon eyed (II, 91);

but in neither of these is there any suggestion of grey. Chaucer's French original reads:

Les yex ot plus vairs c'uns faucons.

¹ There is a movement on foot to correct our color terminology. One of the laws laid down in this scheme is that non-unitary colors should not have unitary names such as 'brown,' 'purple' and 'orange.' Mrs. Christine Ladd-Franklin, who is my authority, has kindly given me the following note summarized from her articles, "Color Terminology," "Color Theories," etc., in *The American Encycl. of Ophthalmology*, vol. iv, 1914, and from an address given before the Psychological Association, January, 1914:

"Just as we actually say blue-green and yellow-green for the chromatic blends of green with blue and yellow respectively, so we should, when speaking with precision, say the reddish-blues or the bluish-reds, the red-yellows or the yellow-reds, instead of purple and orange. Brown is a faint blackish-yellow or reddish-yellow. Grey, too, is, in spite of its name, not a unitary sensation, but a color blend, a black-white. For color proper (the chromatic sensations) one can say simply *chroma*. The Esquimaux, as it happens, not being led astray by unitarily named dye-stuffs but getting their chromatic sensations pure from sunsets and from autumn foliage have an absolutely correct color terminology. They distinguish between red-blue and blue-red (our erroneous purple), although that requires them to interchange the order of words of four and five syllables. When we say that a given chroma is orange, it is as if we said, "That tastes lemonadish to me," instead of, "That tastes to me at once sweet and acid."

What, then, does *vairs* mean? The assumption that it means what *we* mean by the word grey because Middle English writers translated it by that word might be justifiable if our texts harmonized with this meaning, but since they do not, the case surely indicates the desirability of an investigation.²

The word *vair* came into the French through the Folk-Latin, being the regular phonetic development from the classical *varium*. In classical Latin its first meaning is 'changing' or 'various,' and it is applied to colors, as in Horace's second satire:

Autumnus purpurea varius colore (4, 83).

Medieval Latin has the same use, as shown in Dante's first eclogue:

Herbarum vario florumque impicta,

and in two songs of the *Carmina Burana*:

Ornatur prato floribus
Varii coloris (53, p. 146).

Picto terre gremio
Vario colore (65, p. 155).

In the Old Provençal we have:

Es tan vayr que semla de totes colors
(*Eluc. de las props. de totes res naturals*, 254).

Modern Spanish has *vario color*, but modern French shows no trace of the folk-word in this meaning, which, since the early 16th century, has been expressed by the learned word *varié*. *Varius* in the sense of 'different' or 'various' occurs also in other connections, as

²In the present article I am making no pretence of having exhausted all possible resources. I have collected, I believe, about all of the material available in this country so far as the Old French is concerned. *La Chanson de Roland*, *Partenopeus de Blois*, *Le Roman de la Rose*, *Huon de Bordeaux*, *Aucassin et Nicolette*, all of the lays of Marie de France, about all that is available of Crestien de Troyes, over three thousand lyrics, many of the shorter fabliaux besides other miscellaneous matter I have read carefully, but the greater part of my citations I have gained by lining through unindexed works and consulting vocabularies where these were available. Some of my citations have been given me by interested friends. In one or two instances I have noted variants but with no pretence of editing, a work which I am not qualified to do, but rather to show the possibility of error resulting from inaccurate editing.

in *varia oratio*, in both classical and medieval Latin. Tasso has this expression in *Gerusalemme* (II, 58), and Petrarch in one of his sonnets speaks of *vario stile*.³ Dante has the verb in somewhat the same sense, if I understand the passage:

Quindi m'apparve il temperar di Giove
tra il padre e il figlio; e quivi mi fu chiaro
il variar che fanno di lor dove (Par. XXII, 145 ff.);

but I do not find this in Old Provençal and I find only one instance in the Old French:

ces natures sont vaires et diverses
(Brun. Lat., *Tresor*, p. 5, Chabaille).

Cicero, in his *Academicarum*, uses the word to mean versatile:

Plato et varius et multiplex et copiosus fuit (Ac. I, 4, 17),

but so far as my researches have gone he stands alone in this use.⁴

When we turn, however, to the much quoted saying of Virgil,

. . . varium et mutabile semper
Femina (Aeneid IV, 569),

we find it paralleled frequently both in the Old French and Old Provençal. This use appears to occur also in the Spanish, Italian, Catalan and Portuguese.⁵ The meaning is usually 'false,' but always the sort of falseness which comes of fickleness or changeableness, and in some instances the word means only 'changeable,' with no necessary connotation of falsity. In modern French the learned word *variant* has supplanted the folk-word in this meaning (see Exhibit A).

Another use in the Classical Latin is in designating certain animals; as for instance the leopard, the magpie, a speckled fish and

³ This sonnet I take unverified from Alden's *Primer of English Verse*, p. 271.

⁴ But Rufus Choate has it in the sense of 'extensive': "It is a common belief that Mr. Webster was a various reader; and I think it is true."

⁵ I am here citing the authority of the dictionaries. I have found no examples in any of the Romance tongues except the French and Provençal; but the *Century Dictionary* gives the following from Donne, "thinking you irresolute or various"; and in *The Rivals* we find

"The servile suitors watch her various face;
She smiles preferment, or she frowns disgrace."

certain kinds of horses. I have found no instance in the Old French of *vair* applied to a leopard. I am sure I have seen the word somewhere applied to the magpie, but, as the reference has been lost, I am unable to say whether it was in French or in Provençal. There is a small fish, said to have a coat of many colors, which is called in France to-day *vairon*. This word comes from the Latin *varionem*, which was, so far as I know, never applied to any sort of fish in the Latin period. Whether the fish which is called *vairon* in French is the same as that called *varia* in Latin, I do not know. When we come to the horse, however, the matter stands differently. In this connection we find both *vair* and *vairon*, and the meanings of the two words seems to be identical, except that *vairon* appears never to be used attributively, while *vair* occurs both as substantive and attributive. The horse designated as *vair* or *vairon* is of frequent occurrence in the literature of medieval France.^{5a} In the fabliau *Du Vair Palefroi*, he is an important character, a veritable fairy god-father; in every instance *vair* or *vairon* applied to a horse indicates a fine animal (see Exhibit B). Only in one instance have I found any suggestion of a color-meaning in this connection. I refer to the passage in *Le Roman de Vaces*, where the horses are *blans*, *vairs et ferrous* (Exhibit B, No. 8); and to offset this there is the

Palefroi molt riche—vairs et de riche color

(Exhibit B, no. 17, Of an indefinable color.)

Claudius Corte Italus describes this sort of horse as of

color vario et misto: i pelami varii et misti, . . . composti dei quatro colori suddetti . . . talmente misti et posti insieme et colorati, che impossibil quasi sarebbe, over difficil molto, il bianco dal nero, o dal rosso saper con l'occhio dividere, o discernere, o dire.⁶

We find in Palladius, *de Agricultura in Martio* (cap. 13),

^{5a} I was curious to see if this might perhaps throw a new light on the color of the horse of the Green Knight, but I can find no suggestion of any relation unless it be a remote historical one coming through the description or the armor. The *vert helme gemmé* of medieval French Romance may possibly be related to our word, though I see no direct trace of it. (See Note 16.)

⁶ Liber I, cap. 16. I have not verified this citation, which I have from Du Cange.

De equis et eorum coloribus sequentis meriti, varius cum pulchritudine nigro, vel albino,⁷ vel badio mistus.

Now I understand that it is a sign of quality in a horse if the coat is somewhat dappled,⁸ whether it be black with a mere suggestion of iridescence, bay, with the same suggestion, or a real dapple-gray. I understand also that this appearance is not more common in a gray horse than in a bay or black, but that it is thought to be so because it is more noticeable. Those fine dapple-bays which we see frequently are seldom spoken of as dapple, whereas one almost always hears the grey spoken of so. Perhaps in some instances, such as in *Vair pale-froi*, the descriptive *vair* signifies nothing more definite than *fine*. In the one instance cited (no. 20, Exhibit B), where *Vairon* is the name of the horse, it may be the equivalent of *Beauty*. Sometimes it may mean little more than *glossy*, but the original meaning *must* have been *dapple*; that is, a horse with just that glossy iridescence which I have tried to describe.⁹

We come now to a use of our word not found in the classical Latin, but which survives so vividly as to be open to the charge of having caused confusion in the modern mind as to the meaning of the word in other connections. I refer to its application to the fur of the small grey and white squirrel so much admired throughout the middle ages not only in France but in England. I have arranged my citations in groups (Exhibit C).

Group I represents *vair* as 'a fur' and as 'wealth,' or a symbol

⁷ *Albino*, Latin *albineus*, was until recently restricted in its use to descriptions of horses and meant simply *white*. The meaning we are accustomed to in English came through the French out of the Portuguese and is not earlier certainly than the seventeenth century.

⁸ It is interesting in this connection to observe the use of Welch *brith*, fem. *braith*, pl. *brithion*. *Meirch brithion* is given in Evans as "Speckled, grizzled, or party-colored horses, also piebald." For discussion of this word and its relation to *vair* see page 331 of this article.

⁹ The dictionaries seem to have been led astray in this matter by the modern meaning of *vairon*, which is what we mean by an albino horse. Clédat, in an undated edition of Old French poems, says that *vairon* means 'dapple gray,' and undoubtedly it does in some instances; but it is not restricted to that meaning, as our citations show. The modern meaning of *vairon*, 'albino' must have come into French, I should judge, about the time that the modern meaning of *albino* came in from Portugal, but the ancient and original meaning seems to have faded a good deal before this.

of wealth, as something stored away along with gold, silver and wine; it is the mark of wealth or of royalty in the way of wearing apparel; or it is merely the sign of luxury; or its absence is the sign of the "simple life": it is an object of search by merchants.

Group II deals with *vair* in connection with the word *penne*,¹⁰ from which connection a considerable interest arises. The word

¹⁰ There is considerable confusion concerning this word, its meaning, derivation, and history. Much ink has been used in trying to make all words of this general appearance derive from *pennam* because they are all feminine. Constans gives a passage from the *Roman de Troie*, at p. 67 of his *Chrestomathie*, where the word *pane* occurs, which, it seems to me, must be derived from the neuter plural of *pannum* (collateral form of *pannus*), 'a piled cloth.' I take it to be the same as the modern French *panne* of the same meaning. It occurs throughout the centuries as a feminine, although in classical Latin the prevailing masculine form has given *pan*. Perhaps the word remained neuter in the folk speech and, being habitually used in the plural, passed into the French as a feminine.

The passage referred to in the *Roman de Troie* runs as follows:

Del mantel fu la pane chiere,
Tote enterine et tote entiere:
N'i ot ne piece ne costure.
Co truevent cler en esriture,
Que bestes a vers Orian,—
Cele de treis anz est mout grant,—
L'on les claime dindialos:
Mout vaut la pel et plus li os.
Onc deus ne fist cele color
En teint n'en herbe ne en flor,
Dont la pel ne seit coloree.

(Here follows an account of the manner of taking the beast)

De cele beste fut la pane:
Basmes, encens ne tumiame
N'uelent si bien come el faiseit:
Tot le drap del mantel covreit;
Deugiee ert plus que nus ermines.

This *pane* is undoubtedly fur, but when we recognize it as derived from *pannus* it no longer confuses the use and meaning of *penne*. Our word *penne* is sometimes used in the sense also of edge or rim: *Partonopeus de Blois*, cited by Ste. Palaye from MS.

Partonopeus le fiert halt delez la penne de l'escu.

Artur, cited by Godefroy from MS. Richelieu, 337, f. 65: Le colps fu si granz et si rudement feruz, si descent de desus la pane de l'escu qui d'ivuire estoit.

It is not quite clear how this meaning developed. It may have come from the practice of pointing the quill of a feather for a pen; but it seems quite as likely that it came from the practice of making border trimming, edging, of feathers. This practice was very extensive, as we know from frequent references. A grewsome variation of it occurs in Book I. of Malory's *Morte Darthur*, chap. 24, where King Ryons trims his mantel with the beards of kings.

occurs in a poem by Lo Monge de Montodon, which Appel gives on pages 83 and 84 of his *Chrestomathie provençale*. The line runs :

doas penas en un mantel,

and means two rows of trimming on one mantel. This trimming may have been of fur, or it may have been of feathers. In the first passage cited (Exhibit C, Group II; as also in 5, 6, and 9) it seems to mean 'fur,' but in 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8 the meaning is indeterminate.¹¹ We have already seen how *vair* means 'unstable, easily turned, fickle'; and I have cited a passage where Satan was said to be changeable as a *vaire* plume or feather. Let me cite at greater length :

Le gai apel nostre aversaire
Et ses engiens se plume voire;
Sathanas est vairs con voire plume

(reference as in Exhibit A. 4).

Now if we make sense out of this, it attributes to the feather, and to Satan, the sort of changeableness which, in a feather, is best described in English by the word *fluffy*. *Penne voire*, therefore, may be a fluffy feather trimming, more especially appropriate since *penne* in its original sense means feather, but in such passages as *Penas vayras amh erminis*, the contrast with ermine suggests 'fur' as the meaning of *vayras*. Undoubtedly both kinds of trimming were used and probably the writer did not always know which he had in mind, that is, whether that particular kind of trimming was made of fur or of feathers.

The third group (Exhibit C, III) comprises those citations in which *vair* seems to mean some sort of cloth: perhaps some sort of brocade, perhaps merely a changeable weave, possibly a tapestry weave. In some of these citations the meaning of cloth is not very distinct, but when taken with their contexts it becomes so. In those

¹¹ Littré says in regard to the word *panne*:

Diez le tira du Latin *penna*, plume, qui, il est vrai, n'a jamais eu le sens d'étoffe veloutée, mais par l'intermédiaire de l'allemand *Feder*, qui a signifié plume et velours, et qui aurait été traduit par *penne* dans les langues romanes. Il est peut-être plus naturel d'y voir une forme féminine du Latin *pannus*, étoffe; non sans influence de *panus*, fil de tisserand, à en juger par des textes où *pienne* signifie fil.—The *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* merely marks the etymology of the word as *incertaine*.

taken from Crestien de Troyes it is interesting to look up the parallel passages in the Middle High German, but owing to the greater brevity of the German, I find in all only two such parallels, one in the passage from *Eric et Enide* (l. 1574), and one in that from *Yvain* (l. 233). In both cases the citation from Crestien is a very small part of a very long description. In the one from *Eric et Enide* he has forty-eight lines against Hartmann von Aue's one, in which the robe is described simply as of *grüner samût*. In *Yvain*, also, Hartmann is much more brief than Crestien, saying only:

Ein scharlaches mäntelin daz gap si mir an.¹²

The meaning to which the dictionaries give the greatest space concerns heraldry, but this use is of later development than the other uses discussed in this paper. In the reading I have done I have met with few references to heraldry and only two where the word *vair* formed a part of the expression. I have already cited one of these,¹³ the other occurs in the *Roman de Tristan*,

Escu ot d'or a vair freté.

There is a passage in *La Chanson de Roland* which refers probably¹⁴ to some sort of insignia,

Escus unt genz de multes conoissances
(line 3090 of Gautier's edition).

But in the description of the angry Ganelon's eyes the word *vair*¹⁵ is used in quite the same way as in later writers. Authorities are not agreed on the meaning of *vair* and its modern equivalents in heraldry and I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the different opinions.¹⁶

¹² It will be noticed that three of the citations in this group spell our word *vere*, *ver* (nos. 4, 5 and 8). For a discussion of this spelling see p. 342 of this article. It is hardly possible to take either 4 or 5 to mean *green*. *Plïson ver* in 8 might possibly be taken so, though on the whole it seems unlikely.

¹³ *Chanson d'Antioche* (Exhibit C, group I).

¹⁴ This passage is thought not to have any connection with the system of blasonry which grew up under the influence of the crusades.

¹⁵ This is the only occurrence of the word in the whole of the *Chanson de Roland*, and the *Chanson de Guillelme* does not contain the word at all.

¹⁶ Although blasonry is, for the most part, lacking in the literature which I have been reading in this study, there is no lack of description of armour. In the *Chanson d'Antioche* we have

By the fifteenth century *vair* was fading out of the French language, and by the seventeenth, when Perrault came to write down the fairy tales which the old nurse had been telling his son, he found some trouble with the expression, *Pantoufle de vair*, said to be worn by Cinderella.¹⁷ Probably the child, in listening to the tale, had thought, *verre*; fairy god-mothers do strange things, and the child mind is direct; and so, because the word had survived its meaning, it got written down as something else. The revival of Old French brought the word into the dictionaries with the meaning 'fur,' but the fairy tale remained unchanged; glass slippers are much more interesting—because impossible as dancing slippers—than fur ones. Mr. Axon, in the New York *Evening Post* for November 15, 1909,¹⁸ suggests that they were green, because there is a confusion also with that word, but I think he is mistaken. Madame d'Aulnoy,¹⁹ writing about the same time as Perrault, says they were of red satin. In the Scotch version²⁰ our heroine jumps right over the heads of the guards whom the Prince has placed at the door, and in doing so loses one of her "beautiful satin slippers." Grimm²¹

quascus porta auberc e vert elm Sarazi (l. 23).

Tristan (Bérout):

Tes jambes voi de riche paile
Chaucies et o verte maile,
Et les sorchauz d'une escarlate (l. 3729).

The Moniage Guillaume:

vert hiaume (l. 5775); vert helme gemmé (l. 6049).

In these citations, chosen at random, we have the word *vert*, which is certainly correct for *green* and refers to the bronze armour of the period.

¹⁷ *Cendrillon, ou la petite pantoufle de verre*, from Andrew Lang's *Perrault's Popular Tales*, edited from the original edition of 1697.

¹⁸ *Green Eyes and Glass Slippers*. Also reprinted in *The Nation* of current date.

¹⁹ I take this on Mr. Lang's authority; see his introduction to work as cited above.

²⁰ *Revue Celtique*, vol. III, p. 365. Report by Andrew Lang of the story *Rashin Coatie*, as told by Margaret Craig of Darliston, Elgin. The slipper was certainly "possessed" in this tale for when the "little red Calfe" had clothed rashin Coatie "yet braver than ever" for the prince's bride, the slipper jumped right out of his pocket and on to her foot.

²¹ *Kinder und Hausmärchen*, Die Brüder Grimm, *Aschenputtel*. In the first place Aschenputtel was furnished with "Seide und Silber ausgestickte Pantoffeln," but on the third and last night there was an improvement in her apparel and her *Pantoffeln waren ganz golden*, and it was one of these that stuck to the step as she fled from the king's palace.

says they were *ganz golden*, and again, *klein und zierlich und ganz golden*. In the Greek of Strabo and Aelian²³ we are told that the Prince's men, when they picked up the slipper, said the lady must have been beautiful because she certainly had a pretty foot, and this is as near as we come to knowing what sort of slippers our Cinderella wore in Greece, but there is a similar expression in the Welsh. In Lady Charlotte Guest's translation of the *Lady of the Fountain* we find that both Lunette and her mistress are said to have upon their feet "shoes of variegated leather" and the original runs as follows,

Adwy wintas o gordwal brith am y threat,²⁴

brith being the word translated *variegated*. Strangely enough this word has a history similar to *vair*. Its original meaning was 'marked with many colors,' and it ran through the various derived and figurative meanings in very much the same manner as *varius*. It was applied to plumcake and intermittent fever, to mixed weather and freaky youngsters, to dapple horses, the pied wag-tail and salmon-trout. Always it means 'changeable,' but changeable in different ways. Why Lady Guest translated it just as she did I do not know, perhaps she knew of variegated leather used for dancing shoes. Chrestien de Troyes does not mention the subject; perhaps shoe leather does not appeal to psychological minds. In the very large collection of shoes in the *Musée de Cluny* I do not remember any which would answer to this description. There are shoes of painted leather, of leather cut and embossed, of satin, cloth of gold, brocade, changeable weaves of wool and of silk, but so far as I can recall, none of variegated leather.²⁴ One may be sure, however, that Cinderella's slippers were neither glass nor fur, but of some

²³ *Griechische und Albanesische Märchen*, Johannes G. von Hahn, Leipzig, 1864, vol. I.

²⁴ Lady Guest's edition of the *Mabinogion* in the original Welsh.

²⁴ Cinderella was not the only person in medieval France who wore shoes of *vair*. In Godefroy's *Lexicon* I find a citation from *Chansons Normandes du 16 S.* which I have not been able to locate so as to get the context. The citation runs thus:

Chausses de vair m'a faict porter.

suitable material, and that their elegance was sufficiently designated to the medieval mind by the word *vair*.²⁵

But by far the most interesting and extensive use of *vair* is in descriptions of eyes, and this use again is largely French. The Latin *varius* is never found in this connection, so far as I know. I made a special search for it in medieval love lyrics where *oculorum portis*, *lumen oculorum*, *lux oculorum aurea*, *siderea luce lucent ocelli*, *oculorum acies*, *stellatos oculos*, *venator oculus* and many other expressions descriptive of eyes are found. *Varius* is also found, but not in description of eyes. In the classical Latin again we find eyes described in various ways. Ausonius uses the expression *oculos caerulea*,²⁶ and Tacitus describes the eyes of the Germans as *truces et caerulei*,²⁷ while Caesar says of them, *aciem oculorum dicebant ferre potuisse*.²⁸ Caesar is said to have had black eyes and of a wonderfully keen sight,²⁹ but I fail to find in Latin literature any use of *varius* in this connection.

Turning to the Old French we find, in the *Chanson de Roland*, the description of Ganelon in his anger at being sent to Saragossa:

Vairs out les oils e mult fier le visage.

(L. 304, Gautier's edition.)

In the *Rolandslied* we find nothing to correspond until we come to the place where Ganelon starts off on his errand. There is no word here that corresponds to *vair*, but the idea is the same:³⁰

Sin antluzze was hêrsam,
Sin varwe thiû bran
Sam thie liechten viures flammen.

²⁵ Miss Cecile Hugon, lecturer in French literature to the Oxford Society for Women's Education, London, recently suggested that the "glass slipper" of Cinderella, at once so puzzling and captivating a detail of the story to English children, is due to a mistranslation of the French of Perrault. Perrault wrote, not "soulier de verre," but "soulier de vair," "vair" being a kind of fur. We may be sure, said Miss Hugon, that Cinderella wore little gray shoes with fur round the top and had never heard of glass slippers.—*New York Sun*, April 18, 1915.

²⁶ Ausonius, ix, 3, 10. Juvenal uses the same expression in *Satire* xiii, 164.

²⁷ *Germania*, I, 4.

²⁸ *Gallic War*, I, 39.

²⁹ Suetonius, *De Vita Caesarum*, Book II, sec. 45.

³⁰ *Das Rolandslied*, verse 1658.

In short, this description is of the same significance as Swinburne's, where he makes Chastelard say to Mary Stuart, when she has taken his sword and then begged him to take it back again:

Yea, you are better so,
Without the sword; your eyes are stronger things,
Whether to save or slay.

In none of these passages is there any mention of color⁸¹ in the eye, nor is there need. One does not think of color in such a scene, it is the spirit, the flash of living fire. And this is the great charm of an eye at any time. Certainly the eye is the one feature favored characteristically by its changing, varying expression, hence it is the one which came to be described by the word *vair*—the word which means essentially changing.

It will be noticed that among the citations given, a considerable number describe the eye simply as *vair*.⁸² We hear the expression, "speaking eye" which seems in some instances to parallel *vair uel*,⁸³ but often the meaning appears to be merely 'beautiful' or 'lovely.' Often, as in the case of Cinderella's slipper, *vair* says of eyes all that can be said in their praise. So Gautier de Dargies addresses Gace Brulé:

A en li toutes beautez
Le(s) vis est frès couloureuz,
Ex vairs, bouche bien assise
Cors qui m'alume et atise (see Exhibit D. 7).

And some unknown poet of the thirteenth century catalogues a lady's charms thus:

Je suis sade et brunete
Et joenne pucelete,
S'ai color vermeillete,
Eux verz, bele bouchete (Ex. D. 23).

⁸¹ It is interesting in this connection to note that although so much has been written about the beautiful eyes of Marie Stuart, we are unable to say of what color they were. Some say grey, some hazel, some brown. There is a similar disagreement about her hair, but probably that changed. It is almost certain that it was golden in early youth, changing to dark brown with maturity. Hair with such a history always retains a goldish lustre which makes it appear in the sunlight much lighter than in the shade.

⁸² Most of the citations down to no. 42 in Exhibit D.

⁸³ As in no. I, 27 and 41.

Very much in the same vein is Deschamps' virelay:

J'ai vers yeulx, petits sourcis,
Le chief blont, le nez traitis,
Ront menton, blanche gorgette;
Sui je, sui je, sui je belle? (Ex. D. 33.)

Sometimes *vair* is not quite sufficient. Persewis is described as having *beaus iols vairs* (Ex. D. 49), and the *beaus iols vairs* (Ex. D. 50) of Partenopeus help his lady to recognize him in disguise, Polixenain has *tres beaus ieux vairs* (Ex. D. 55, b); but we also speak of "fine, expressive eyes," and of "beautiful, large eyes," just as in the Old French we find *iols gros et vairs* (Ex. D. 47). We also couple the word *laughing* with *beautiful* (Ex. D. 60), or even with *fine*, and this we find also many times in the Old French. M. Gaston Paris, in his notes on *Aucassin et Nicolette*,⁸⁴ uses the Mod. Fr. *vif* to translate the O. Fr. *vair*, and I think we can do no better than accept his interpretation; only we of the English tongue have no exact equivalent. 'Bright' does not meet the case, nor have we the right feeling for 'mobile.' 'Spirited' comes nearer than anything else, but this again is too cumbersome a word for that flash and luster, the rapid changes of tone and expression that we catch in a really fine eye regardless of its color. Goethe's definition of grace as *schönheit in bewegung*, comes pretty near to what our word means.

Let us translate our word, then, by 'fine' or 'beautiful' or 'expressive' when it occurs alone and also when it stands in conjunction with such additional adjectives as *seignorius*, *ciers*, *plaisans*, *dous*; but there are certain other expressions which require further attention: *noirs et .i. pau vair* (Ex. D. 62), for instance, and *moitie blans*, *moitie vers* (Ex. D. 64a), also those passages involving a comparison.

Let us take first of all those where the *faucon* is involved (Ex. D. 70-78). The bird referred to is the Peregrine Falcon, or, to be more exact, *Falco peregrinus anatum*.^{84a} Its eye is a wonderfully rich brown in color, its wit is sharp and keen, its wings strong and

⁸⁴ *Chrestomathie du Moyen Age*, p. 131

^{84a} See any standard work of ornithology on the family of *Falconidae*, also *Book of Falconry*, Geo. Tuberville, 1575, chapter on the *Falcon-gentle*.

swift beyond belief, its disposition in captivity very affectionate. Fancy, then, the changes one would observe in its eye—soft, appealing glances swiftly changing to the sharp, prey-sighting look of a “huntin’ hawk’s which gaed throu’ and throu’ me like a Hieland Durk.”³⁵ It is with this bird that John Skelton compares Mistress Margaret Hussey, *gentle as a falcon*.³⁶ An unknown poet of the early 14th century says of Christ,

He is faucon in friht derneest in dale.³⁷

Twice in the *Chanson de Roland* we find the line:

Plus est isnels que nen est uns falcun,³⁸

said first of Gramimund, the horse of the *paiens Valdabrun*s and then of the horse of Marsilie. Dante gives us a charming picture of the falcon:

Qual il falcon, ch’ uscendo del cappello
move la testa e coll’ ali si plaude,
voglia mostrando e facendosi bello

Vid’ io farsi quel segno, che di laude
della divina grazia era contesto,
con canti quai si sa chi lassù gaude (Par. XIX, 34).

And again, in the Purgatorio:

Quale il falcon che prima ai piè si mira,
indi si volge al grido, e si protende
per lo disio del pasto che la il tira:
Tal mi fec’ io, e tal, quanto si fende
la roccia per dar via a chi va suso,
n’ andai infino ove il cerchiar si prende (XIX, 64).

It needs no comment on my part to show the affectionate and admiring regard in which this bird was held in medieval Europe. In England, while the *falcon gentle* was as much prized as on the con-

³⁵ Scott, *Heart of Midlothian*, vol. II, ed. of Archibald Constable and Co. London, 1895, p. 225.

³⁶ To Margaret Hussey.

³⁷ Vol. iv of Percy Society Publications (from MS. no. 2253 B. M. circa 1307).

³⁸ Gautier’s ed., l. 1529 and l. 1891.

tinient, it seems to have shared honors with the goshawk.³⁹ This bird is of the same family and has many of the traits of its more aristocratic relative. Its eyes are lighter, less colorful, but still in the red-yellow range. This is Scott's "huntin' hawk," and is the bird referred to in his expression "goshawk glance."⁴⁰ I am not sure of the reference in *Kenilworth*,⁴¹ speaking of Michael Lambourne,

. . . a likely fellow . . . and had a hawk's eye after a pretty wench.
Shakespeare has the goshawk in mind when he makes Helena say:

'Twas pretty, though a plague,
To see him every hour; to sit and draw
His arched brows, his hawking eye, his curls.
(All's Well That Ends Well, I, 1.)

The development seems to have been in this order: The word *vair*, having the intrinsic meaning that we have already shown, was applied to eyes to denote their expressive mobility; then the likeness to the eye of the falcon was observed and the comparison made; then in turn the characteristics of the eye of the falcon reacted on the word *vair*, enriching it and at the same time undermining it, so that finally 'falcon-eyed' absorbed it, and then this expression in turn began to fade out, until it meant little more than 'keen-eyed,' as in Sprague's expression,

³⁹ Skelton, *Magnyfycence*, E.E.T., Extra Series, 98, Stage XI, sc. 16, Description of a hawk:

A byrde full swete
For me full mete;
She is furred for the hete
All to the fete;

Her brows bent,
Her eyen glent
From Tyne to Trent
From Stroude to Kent

A man shall fynde
Many of her Kynde.

We also have Chaucer's

He loketh as a sperhawk with his yēn.

from the Epilogue to the *Nonne Preestes Tale*, said of the priest by the host.

⁴⁰ Scott's *Heart of Midlothian* (as above, note 35), p. 233.

⁴¹ Scott's *Kenilworth*, chap. I.

The Indian of the falcon glance.⁴³

And Tennyson's *falcon-eyed*,⁴³ which seems to refer to the sharp keen-glancing of the Lady Psyche, rather than to any especial beauty of her eyes. The phrase *faucon mué*⁴⁴ did not survive the weakening of the expression. It refers to the time directly following the moult, when all that is admirable in the bird shows at its best; it is a similar expression to *in full feather*. *Les uiz vairs*, then, means *faucon-eyed* quite as truly as, *Les yex plus vairs c'uns faucon*.

We find a rather interesting parallel to *faucon-eyed* in the expression *eagle eye*. Dante sees in the lower regions,

Caesare armato con gli occhi grifagni.⁴⁵

Shakespeare says of King Richard II:

Behold his eye,⁴⁶
As bright as is the eagle's, lightens forth
Controlling majesty.

And of Rosaline:

What peremptory, eagle sighted eye⁴⁷
Dares look upon the heaven of her brow,
That is not blinded by her majesty?

And later on,

A lover's eyes will gaze an eagle blind.⁴⁸

We sing of

The martyr first, whose eagle eye⁴⁹
Could pierce beyond the grave,

referring to St. Stephen looking into heaven. Cooper names his Pathfinder "Hawkeye," and in the earlier book he describes him thus:

⁴³ Speech delivered in 1825 at Boston by Charles Sprague, cited from *Speeches of Charles Sprague*.

⁴⁴ *The Princess*, II, 91.

⁴⁵ This expression occurs in citations 70-74, and in 77, b.

⁴⁶ Dante, *Inferno*, iv, 123.

⁴⁷ *Richard II.*, 3, 68.

⁴⁸ *Love's Labour's Lost*, IV, 3, 222.

⁴⁹ Same, IV, 3, 333.

⁵⁰ *The Church Hymnal*, Boston, 1900, Hymn no. 507, p. 587.

His countenance was calm and his quick, dark, eagle eye moved over the leafy panorama, as if to take in at a glance, every circumstance that might enlighten his mind.⁵⁰

Eagles, by the way, have yellow, hazel or brown eyes. One very rare sea-eagle has eyes of so pale a yellow that, as he flies over the sea, they take on its color by reflection. These eagles, however, are so rare and soar so high in their flight that it is not at all likely that the color of their eyes should have impressed any one strongly.

Again we have the very famous analogy of γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη.⁵¹ *Glaukos* is the adjective which appears to be the parent word of all those on that stem, and γλαύξ is said to have been applied to the owl because of his gleaming eyes. Athena is now thought to have been originally an owl-headed deity from which is derived her epithet of γλαυκῶπις and so perhaps, after all, the best translation is *bright-eyed*,⁵² which completes the circle;⁵³ but for a long time the expression was thought to have a color value. This may have come from the fact that in the statues of this goddess stones were used for her eyes which had a bluish tinge, selected not for that reason but because of their lustre. It is a curious fact that in Latin we find the expression, *caesii oculi Minervae*. Now *caesius* is the adjective applied to the eyes of cats and lions. Was Minerva originally a feline? Blumner⁵⁴ thinks *caesius* signifies, wherever used, exactly the gleam of the lion's eye, but he does not account for its use in describing Minerva's eyes.

We have among our citations (see Exhibit D. 79), only one comparing *les ex vairs* to crystal, but I think it worth considering because such comparison is quite frequently found without the accompaniment of *vair*; for instance, Ronsard says,

Je parangonne a vos yeux ce crystal,⁵⁵

⁵⁰ The *Pathfinder*, chap. I, p. 7, of Everyman's ed.

⁵¹ This expression is of such frequent occurrence in Homer that it seems unnecessary to give references; in Book xxii of the *Iliad* it occurs at ll. 177, 238 and 446. One might give many other references both in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

⁵² We find γλαυκῶπις κόρη at l. 26, Book xxiv. *Iliad*, which is usually translated *Bright eyed maiden*.

⁵³ That is, the owl is γλαύξ because bright-eyed; Athena is owl-headed, therefore γλαυκῶπις when is bright-eyed.

⁵⁴ Blumner, H., *Die Farbenbezeichnungen bei den Römischen Dichtern*, von Hugo Blumner, Berliner Studien, XIII, 1891-2, under *caesius*.

⁵⁵ Sonnets, Book I, no. Lxxv.

the Queen of Love in *The Kingis Quair* has *cristall eyen faire*.⁵⁶
Shakespeare has,

His mistress did hold her eyes locked in her crystal looks,⁵⁷
and

One, her hairs were gold, crystal the other's eyes ;⁵⁸
in Sir Eglamour the child is recognized as noble because of his

Eyen grey as crystalle stone,⁵⁹

and here we must remember that *grey* is the middle English translation of *vair*. Chaucer says of the prioress,

Hir eyen greye as glas,⁶⁰

and of the miller's daughter again he says,

yēn greye as glas.⁶¹

In *Two Gentlemen of Verona* Julia says, in scanning Sylvia's portrait,

Her eyes are grey as glasse and so are mine.⁶²

What is the value of crystal, what of glass in these comparisons?
In *Midsummer-night's Dream* Demetrius says :

Oh Helen, goddess, nymph, perfect divine !
To what, my love, shall I compare thine eyne?
Crystal is muddy.⁶³

Does crystal mean clear? Do glass and crystal mean the same?
Malone thought a grey eye meant a blue one, and Halliwell says,

Perhaps from the comparisons "grey as glass" and "grey as cristal stone," Malone may be right."⁶⁴

⁵⁶ *The Kingis Quair*, ed. Lawson, p. 54, stanza 104.

⁵⁷ *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, II, 4, 89.

⁵⁸ *Love's Labour's Lost*, IV, 3, 142.

⁵⁹ *The Romaunce of Sir Eglamour*, ed. Halliwell, stanza lxxiv.

⁶⁰ Prologue, line 152, Skeat's ed.

⁶¹ *The Reves Tale*, line 54, Skeat's ed.

⁶² *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Act iv, sc. iv, line 193.

⁶³ *Midsummer-night's Dream*, Act ii, sc. i, line 14.

⁶⁴ Note to above.

Now among our citations we find,

vair, riant et cler. . . .

bel oel vairet, riant et cler. . . .

ieux clers, vairs e amors, . . .

li oeil clair et riant, vair et fendu. . . .

in all of which *cler* is coupled with *vair*, but not in way of a comparison. In the *Roman de la Rose* we have:

Anel li baille, et croce et mitre

Plus clère que cristal ne vitre (l. 20411).

Qu'ele est plus clère qu'argent fin (l. 21364).

Au fons, ce dist, a cristaux doubles

Fait luire quant ses rais i giete (l. 21371).

This last is in reference to *li mireoirs perilleus* and the *deus pierres de cristal* which lie at its bottom and which, in the rays of the sun, show *colors plus de cent*. In the *Vie de Saint Léger*, we have:

Guardat, si vit grant clarité.

De ciel vindret, fut de par Deu.

Si com roors en ciel est granz ;

Eissi com flame est cler ardan. ⁶⁵

Now in all four of these citations *cler* seems to mean, not *clear*, but *bright*. *Les iex ot vairs come cristal* might mean brilliant as crystal, and, like it, reflecting many changeful lights. Ronsard's comparison of eyes to cristal may be like his comparison to stars, as in the line,

Oeil, tu serois un bel astre luisant.

Stars are perhaps the most used of any word in poetic descriptions of eyes. Barnfield sings:

. . . My lovely Faire

Whose eye's my starre, whose smiling is my Sunne.

And this would seem also to apply to the *Crystall eyen* of the queen

⁶⁵ Strophe 34.

of Love, to the child whose eyes were

grey as crystalle stone,

and to Shakespeare's *crystal looks* and *crystal eyes*; but in *crystal* is *muddy* we certainly get a connotation of clearness.

And what about glass? *Vitre* is not common glass but of many colors, rich and rare. *Glass* is equivocal. Chaucer's *eyen greye as glass*, and Sylvia's portrait, what shall we say about them? Halliwell evidently considers that both glass and crystal are blue, but I find no authority for that assumption. What did glass mean to the medieval mind? Evidently it would mean what glass then was. Venice was famous throughout the middle ages for her fine glass, which was imported into England and other countries in the form of vases, table ornaments and other ornamental articles mounted in silver and gold. France produced *vitre* also and the finest windows, as we all know, were of the fourteenth century, but England produced only the poorest quality of window glass of a muddy grayish color until well into the fifteenth century. In our citations we have, both in French and English, eyes compared to crystal, and in French we have *vitre* coupled with crystal, we have *vair come cristal* and we have *grey as crystalle stone*; we have pretty good evidence then in these and collateral citations that *crystal* means *brilliant*, and we accept easily a similar meaning for *vitre*; glass occurs in the same connection—twice in Chaucer and once in Shakespeare. Now Chaucer loved nothing better than double meanings. One can imagine his smiling now, in whatever state he may be, at the war of words over his intentions as to the prioress. Those of us who believe him to have been shyly poking fun at her may easily see a double meaning in his description of her eyes: they were grey as glass, that is, grey in the sense of a neutral tint mostly black-and-white blended, like the muddy English glass, or grey in the sense of *vair*, sparkling, colorful and bright, like the rare Venetian glass, or French *vitre*. Of course, in the other case, no one would suppose that he intended to describe the miller's daughter as beautiful; but how like Chaucer to use this word *grey*, which might be either the translation of *vair* or the Old English word *grey*! There is as much humor in the one description as in the other. Spenser, the

serious minded, will take no such risk. He will not compare his lady's eyes to glass because

such baseness mought offend her.

But as to Halliwell? Perhaps the only glass he had ever seen was blue, hence his inference. We must remember, however, that the poets in question had a different mental state in the matter, and to reproduce that mental state it is necessary to reconstruct the time, at least so far as the commodities involved are concerned. If modern research has arrived at a correct knowledge of glass as it existed in the days of Chaucer, then, it seems to me, the above interpretation of his use of the word glass must be satisfactory.⁶⁶

We can now understand the meaning of *noir et .i. pau vair* as 'black and rather changeful' (or 'brilliant'). *Moitié blans, moitié vers* and *aussy vers que genesure* seem to me to come under the head of green eyes. In both of these the spelling is such that it is possible to tell the meaning only by the context. *Vers* may be for *vairs* or quite as well for *verts*; and it will be noticed that there are a number of citations in which the spelling is the same. Mr. Axon, who, as we have seen, thinks Cinderella's slipper was green, bases his argument partly on the fact of green eyes having been admired by poets of France, citing some of the passages which we have here, one of them being from Marot. (See Exhibit D. 36.) Now the edition of Marot's poems from which I have my citations was published in 1731, and the citations are glossed as follows: "Il paroît par cet endroit et beaucoup d'autres que les yeux verts étoient alors une beauté." Evidently, then, by the middle of the eighteenth century there was but one possible interpretation of the expression. Mr. Axon cites Ronsard as using the same expression in reference to naiads, but he does not give his reference, and I find in Ronsard only two instances of *yeux vers*. (See Exhibit D. 39 and 40.) M. Le Grand maintains that wherever this expression occurs it is a mis-writing for *yeux vairs*, but this cannot be maintained. Mr. Douce⁶⁷ will have it that there is such a thing as a green eye and

⁶⁶ See article on glass in *Encyclopedia Brit.*

⁶⁷ M. Le Grand is quoted by Mr. Axon and others. Douce comments on green eyes in his commentaries on Shakspeare and is quoted by Furness in his edition of Shakspeare's works.

that it occurs unmistakably in literature. Mr. Axon takes the same view and cites among others the eyes of Dante's Beatrice. As in most disputes both sides are right and both are wrong. It is a matter of confusing usages. Let us see if we can make a cleavage. Those speaking on the side of green eyes find their strongest support in Spanish literature. Mr. Axon cites Cervantes in a speech of Doña Clara :

Este si que se puede decir cabello de orp :
estos si que son ojos de esmeraldas.

and a South American poet, José Rivera Indarte :

Los verdes ojos del rey
Parecidos esmeraldas,
La purpura de la rosa
Sus rojos labios no iguala.

I recently had the opportunity of talking with a Spaniard to whom I put the question, "Just what do you mean by *los ojos verdes*?" and she said, "Why, eyes like hers," pointing to one present who had unmistakably green eyes. Becquer, in his charming story,⁶⁸ *Los Ojos Verdes*, has made very clear what he means by the expression. It means to him *green eyes*, of a wonderful, limpid brilliance like unto emeralds. He says, in a brief introductory note,

"Yo creo que he visto unos ojos como los que he pintado en esta leyenda. No sé si en sueños, pero yo los he visto. De seguro no los podré describir tales cuales ellos eran, luminosos, transparentes como las gotas de la lluvia que se resbalan sobre las hojas de los árboles después de una tempestad de verano. De todos modos, cuento con la imaginación de mis lectores para hacerme comprender en este que pudiéramos llamar boceto de un cuadro que pintaré algún día."

In the story he describes the fairy as follows:

"Ella era hermosa, hermosa y pálida, como una estatua de alabastro. Uno de sus rizos caía sobre sus hombros, deslizándose entre los pliegues del velo como un rayo de sol que atraviesa las nubes y en el cerco de sus pestañas rubias brillaban sus pupilas como dos esmeraldas sujetas en una joya de oro."

⁶⁸ *Legends, Tales and Poems* by Gustave Adolf Becquer, ed. Olmstead, Ginn and Co., p. 14 and p. 22.

Certainly we cannot doubt that green eyes have been sincerely admired at least by the Spaniards; and we have only to determine in relation to such expressions as *euls vers*, in each instance, not if it *can* mean green eyes, but if it actually does.

But let us now consider Dante's Beatrice. The passage referred to by Mr. Axon runs as follows:

. . . Fa'che le viste non risparmi;⁶⁹
posto t'avem dinanzi agli smeraldi,
ond' Amor già ti trasse le sue armi.

Dante uses emerald in comparison also in an earlier passage which runs thus:⁷⁰

Oro ed argento fino e cocco e biacca,
indico legno lucido e sereno,
fresco smeraldo in l'ora che si fiacca,

Dall' erba e dalli fior dentro a quel seno
posti, ciascun saria di color vinto,
come dal suo maggiore è vinto il meno.

This relieves us of any possible doubt as to whether *emerald* meant green to Dante; but there is another consideration. Dante was above all symbolic, and there is always a danger of wrong interpretation of him unless this fact is taken into account. In canto twenty-nine of the *Purgatorio* we again find the emerald, and the passage runs thus:⁷¹

Tre donne in giro, dalla destra rota,
venian danzando: l'una tanto rossa
ch' a pena fôra dentro al foco nota;

L'altr' era come se le carni e l'ossa
fossero state di smeraldo fatte;
la terza pareva neve testè mossa;

and these ladies represent the three theological virtues; red for love, green for hope, and white for faith. I do not wish to appear to constitute myself a Dante critic, but I would nevertheless suggest

⁶⁹ *Purgatorio*, xxxi, 115.

⁷⁰ *Purgatorio*, vii, 73.

⁷¹ *Purgatorio*, xxix, 121.

that Dante did not think of describing Beatrice's eyes literally as they had been known to him in the flesh, but to imply that her eyes stood to him in this earthly paradise for Hope.

Now Dante is not alone in using symbolism, but all color symbolism does not agree: we find in a Spanish comedy of the 16th or 17th century that green does symbolize hope:⁷²

Por ser yo el de menes partes
Es forzoso que aqui sea
Quien tiene mas esperanza
Yasi, el escoger es fuerza
El color verde.

But in a prose sermon preceding one of the *Miracles de Nostre Dame* we find "le vert d'abstinence"; and Chaucer, in the *Prioress's Tale* says:⁷³

This gemme of chastitee, this emeraude,
And eek of martirdom the ruby bright.

In the *Roman de la Rose* the face of avarice is "aussi vert com une cive," and Chaucer translates:

And also green as any leek.

Spenser makes the robe of lechery green, while Shakespeare, in *Timon of Athens*, makes virginity the same color. Again, in a sonnet he makes it the sign of youth:⁷⁴

Since first I saw you fresh which yet are green.

In *Othello* jealousy is the "greene-ey'd monster," but in *Two Noble Kinsmen* we have in Emelia's prayer to Diana:

O sacred, shadowy, cold and constant queen,
Sweet, solitary, white as chaste, and pure
As wind swept snow. . . .

⁷² A Spanish Comedy by Don Agrestin Moreto y Cabana, successor to Lope de Vega. The passage referred to describes a fête where each gentleman announces his favorite color, and the lady who has a scarf of that color shows it and the two are matched for the evening. In the same connection blue is the color of jealousy.

⁷³ *The Prioress's Tale*, 1799.

⁷⁴ Sonnet 104.

. . . O, vouchsafe
 With that thy rare green eye—which never yet
 Beheld thing maculate—look on thy virgin.

Does this mean virginity? In *As You Like It* Orlando says:

And thou, thrice-crowned queen of night, survey
 With thy chaste eye, from thy pale sphere above.

Which makes green mean 'chaste,' if Diane is supposed to have eyes of that color. This variety of color-symbolism, however, need not trouble us, for in most cases the explanation is to be found by the key of the context.

Our last citation brings us to another class of green eyes: if Diana's eyes are green for a purpose, Minerva's are so by an error. We saw, in considering the eyes of Athene, that through the use of green-colored stones to represent her eyes in statues and also through a fading out of the meaning of *γλαυκῶπις* there had arisen a belief that her eyes were green or a greenish blue, sea-blue perhaps, and this idea was transferred to Minerva and with the Renaissance the idea was revived. Therefore when La Fontaine, in speaking of Minerva, says,

Tout le monde entourait la déesse aux yeux vers,

there is no question but that he means *green*, nor is there any question, either, in regard to the meaning of "Pallas aux yeux vers" in Ronsard's ode to Marguerite de Savoie. Whether in the case of Marot's "Venus aux yeux verts" the idea is that a goddess born of the foam of the sea should have green eyes, or whether it indicates that the general impression of green eyes had been extended to all deities, I cannot say. It is possible that this is in the same class with Ronsard's invocation of curses on himself if he ever love a lady with *yeux vers*, meaning clearly a blond; but I am inclined to think not. It seems likely that Marot was thinking of the sea-green, for the word is spelled *verts*, whereas in other instances he has *vers* evidently in the sense of *vair*. Alfred de Musset seems to have the same idea of sea-green in his *Namouna*:

Sur les bras du jeune homme et sur ses pieds d'ivoire,
 La naiade aux yeux verts pleurait en le quittant.

The idea is the same as Becquer's of his fairy, who was a sort of water nymph, a Spanish Undina. Surely no color could be more appropriate for a water goddess's eyes than green.

We have not even yet finished with green eyes. What does "aussy vers que genesvre" mean? The juniper is of a bluish green, but greener perhaps to our minds because it is foliage; in a fabric the color might be called green-blue, but there is a green here without mistake, and, so far as I can make out, without symbolism. The idea seems to be of a cold, forbidding look, juniper hedged in and forbidding or defying approach. Douce and Axon both cite Plautus's expression *oculis herbeis*, but this, I think, is surely humorous, intentionally so. In Shakespeare again we have Juliet's nurse saying in praise of Paris:

An eagle, madam,
Hath not so green, so quick, so fair an eye.

As we have seen, eagles have not green eyes. The nurse had heard eyes praised by a comparison with those of eagles, and she mixed her terms; but there is still the "green eye," which she must have had also from the speech of the day. What is its meaning? None of the symbolic meanings, whether for good or bad, seem to fit here, nor are we dealing with divinity. Thisbe's lament, "His eyes were greene as leeks," impresses one as humorous but we must remember that this expression, "eyes green as leeks" is still current in Wales in a complimentary sense.⁷⁵ Our color sense is perhaps at

⁷⁵ See note on this passage in Furness ed.

fault in this matter. It may be that we call eyes blue that should be called green, discriminating against that color. Those eyes which my Spanish friend called *verdes*, most people call *blue*, yet they are really green. Green is the color of returning spring, hence of hope, but also of vitality. Caesar's eyes are described as *nigris vegetisque* and in the *Roman de la Rose* we have *li vers boutons*, meaning *fresh bud* but with a connotation of loveliness, youth and life. There is a folk belief that green in the eye is a sign of vitality and good health. If the authors of the symbolic green eyes could not call to mind a real and lovely eye of that color, is it likely that they would have chosen that particular symbolism when their obvious intention is to praise? We must surely admit that the green eye

not only exists but that it has been honestly praised in more languages than that of Spain.

But in the same work in which we find *aussy vers que genesvre* we find also, *Doux yeux, moitié blans, moitié vers*. What does this mean? It is a curious piece of literature, this book on the observance of Love; and I do not pretend to understand wholly what the author is trying to say. The idea here seems to be of a sympathetic eye, so perhaps *vers* is for *vairs*, but *blans*⁷⁶ does not convey any clear notion and I wonder if it is not a mis-writing for *blons* so meaning blue, eyes partly blond (that is blue?) and partly green? One sees such eyes, and if this is what is meant we have the same sense as in Ronsard's twenty-sixth sonnet:

Plustost les cieux de mer seront couvers,
Plustost sans forme ira confus le monde
Que je sois serf d'une maistresse blonde,
Ou que j'adore une femme aux yeux vers.
Car cet oeil brun qui vint premier eteindre
etc.

Our word had been almost forgotten by Ronsard's time. Indeed in reading several hundred poems of Villon, Charles d'Orléans and their contemporaries I found not a single example. So far as I know Du Bellay never used it and, as I have shown, the only other example which I have found in the works of Ronsard is unmistakably used in the sense of *green*. I am not at all sure that Ronsard knew the real word *vair*, but if he did, he knew it in the sense of *blond*, a light colored eye. He knew and used the learned word *varié*. Perhaps in this as in the other instance he meant frankly *green*.

Now, of the other instances of *vers eux* which I have cited, all, I take it, are variant writings for *vair*, since the use is identical, except the one from the *Régime du Corps*, which is certainly *green* because *vairs* occurs in its own proper connection in the same passage, and except also the one from Sorel, which is merely copied unintelligently from the prose Romances which the 17th century delighted to burlesque. The spelling, however, leads one to ques-

⁷⁶ But this may refer to the white of the eye, in which case the color may be green or it may be blue.

tion whether the 17th century did not believe with the editor of Marot's poems that the word meant *green*. We see then that both Le Grand and Douce were wrong in making their statements general, but that the one was right in finding *vers* a mis-writing for *vair*, and the other in recognizing the reality of a green eye—a reality to which we owe:

O lips that mine have grown into,
Like April kissing May.
O fervid eye-lids, letting through
Those eyes, the greenest of things blue,
The bluest of things grey. Swinburne, *Felice*.

Vair, then, as applied to eyes, seldom has a color significance. In its earlier uses, if truly read, it never has such meaning; in its later uses there is sometimes a hint of color but never anything definite. The word itself never meant *green* though there is a period when *vers* and variants are used, sometimes to mean *green* and sometimes to mean *vair*; but this confusion is one of spelling and not of real meaning. This difficulty (I mean confusion of spelling and sound) crops out again in the English translation of *vair*. There is a good deal to be said about the word *gray* as applied to eyes and the dawn in English poetry, but that I must reserve for another paper.

EXHIBIT A

(Passages in Old French and Old Provençal that correspond with Vergil's *varium et mutabile semper femina*.)

1. Etienne de Fougères, Bishop of Rennes 1168-78, *Liures des Manières*. Pt. 1, pp. 1-2:

Quant guerre out, ne sevent que faire,
Ques eschines ne queis a traire,
Quar le plus de la gent est vaire.
2. P. 400:

La nature des mauvais est tozjors vaire et movable.
3. *Roman de Thèbes*, Société des anciens textes français, II, I, 3657:

Sire, font il, que vucus tu faire
Vers ceste gente, que est mout vaire?
4. Renclus de Moiliens, *Carité*, ed. Van Hamel (cited by Godefroy), CLXXIX, III:

Sathans est vairs con vaire plume.

5. *Elucidari de las proprietatz de totas res naturals*, fol. 254 (cited by Raynouard, *Lexique* s.v.):
Es tan vayr que semla de totas colors.
6. *Deudes de Prades*, cited by Raynouard, *Lexique Roman*:
Non a lengua vaira ni pigua
D'aquesta gent falsa, mendiga
Qu' ieu non volgues enans trencar.
7. Arnaud Daniel, Appel's *Chrestomathie*, p. 66, l. 18:
Qu' ieu sui fis druz cars e non vars.
8. Rambaud d'Orange, cited by Raynouard (as above, 6):
A lieis qu' am ses cor var.
9. Guillaume, moine de Béziers, cited by Raynouard (as above, 6):
Cum fis amaire
Murai ses cor(s) vaire.
10. Marcabru, *Poésies complètes du Troubadour* —, Dejeanne, Toulouse, no. 5, st. 3:
Non puosc dompnas trobar gaire
Que blanch' amistatz no i vaire,
A present o a saubuda.
11. Same, no. 24, st. 2:
C'amors vair'al mieu veiair' a l' usatge trahidor.
12. Boniface Calvo, Appel's *Chrestomathie*, p. 79:
Mas s'ilh auzis
con li sui fis
e laials ses tot cor vaire.
13. *Le Roman de Flamanca*, Paul Meyer, l. 4272:
Amors non vol ges domna vaira
Non es domna pos son cor vaira
E non atent aisso que dis:
14. Bertran d'Alamanon, no. 18, 1, 3:
Qa us ai seruit ses cor vaire.
15. Peire d'Alvernhe, ed. Zenker, p. 122, st. 2:
S'er fis o mesclat de vaire.
(Raynouard gives this passage with a slightly different reading):
Si es fis o mesclatz de vayre.
16. Peire d'Alvernhe, *Manualetto Provensale*, Crescini, p. 23, l. 73:
Pero sonetz fai mout gaillartz
Ab motz vaires monz e bastarts
Elui apell' om Cossedon.
(But Appel gives this differently, *Chrestomathie*, p. 119):
Pero us sonetz fai galhartz
ab motz marabotz e bastarts;
e luy apel' hom Cossezen.

EXHIBIT B

(Citations pertaining to horses)

1. *Partonopeus de Blois*,
l. 6788: Si vos donroi un cheval ver¹⁰
(this is the horse given by Urake to the hero and other references to the same horse are):

2. 1.6879: Puis est montes el bel vairon.
3. 1.6881: Vairon est beaus sor tot rien.
4. 1.6893: Partonopeus vairon esproeve.
Du Cange cites from
5. *Rursum*:
Estouls de Langres sist ou Vair de Cataigne,
Et Bernard sist sor le Vair d'Allemagne.
.
Le bon cheval qui ot la crope voire.
and from
6. *Le Roman de Gaidon*:
Ferrous li rand vairon qu'il ot perdu.
.
Et Amanfrois sor vairon d'Aquilee.
(still from Du Cange)
8. *Le Roman de Vaces*:
Et gaigner destriers blans, vair et ferrous.
9. *Le Roman de Tristan*, Joseph Bédier ed. in Soc. des anc. text. fr.
1.2179: Veient venir un chevalier
Les walos sur un vair destrier.
10. *Elie de Saint Gille*, Gaston Raynaud ed. in Soc. des anc. text. fr.
1.661: Elyes sist el vair que Malpriornt toli.
11. 1.1622: Et li vairés d'Espagne me fust chi aprestés.
12. *Aiol*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
1.4243: (speaking of a horse)
Il est et beaus et cras et bien garnis,
Si n'en e nil millor en ces pais
Fors seulement le vair roi Loeys.
13. *La Mort Aymeri de Narbonne*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
1.1795: Un vair destrier qui fu a l'aumaçor.
14. *Robert le Diable*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
1.2138: Sor un vair destrier cacheor
Est li empereres montés.
15. *Guillaume de Dole*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
1.2740: Tant qu'il tint le frain Vairon.
16. *Entrée d'Espagne*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
1.8483: Lors a brocé li conte desor son destrer voire.
17. *Fabliau du Vair Palefroï*, ed. Montaiglon, *Recueil d. Fabliaux*, vol. I, p. 30.
1.171: Avoit un palefroï molt riche
Aussi com li contes afiche:
Vairs ert et de riche color;
La semblance de nule flor
Ne color c'on séust descrire
Ne sauroit pas nus hom eslire
Qui si fust propre en grant biauté,
Sachiez qu'en nule réauté
N'en avoit mes a icel tans
Si bon, ne si soef portans.

18. *Moniage Guillaume*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.

l. 697: Sire Guillaume, par l'ame de mon paire
Jou nel vauroie por une vace vaire.

This is the only instance of the word in connection with a cow which I have found. It seems to have the same value as in connection with horses, and is interesting because the word *brith* is also used in this connection. See note 8.

19. Ste. Palaye cites from MS. 7218, f. 249:

Dui chevalier vont chevauchant
Li uns *vairon*, l'autre bauçent.

20. and from MS. 7218, f. 342:

Vairon a non cel roncín que je di.

EXHIBIT C: Group I

(*Vair* meaning 'fur,' 'wealth' or used as a symbol of wealth)

1. Wright's *Political Poems and Songs from Edward III. to Richard III. Song Against the Friars*,
Vol. I, p. 265: For some vaire, and some gryse.
2. MS. Lincoln, A. I.
f. 248: Well furrede with vaire and the gryse.
3. *Rel. Ant.*
l. 121: Tho' I was strong and wis
And werede feir and grys.
4. Scott, *Lady of the Lake*,
IV, 12: Pall and vair no more I wear
Nor thou the crimson sheen.
5. *Chanson d'Antioche*, cited from Appel's *Chrestomathie*,
p. 33, no. 6, 37: Tuh so li entrensen var o gris o ermi.
6. *Girart de Roussillon*, cited from Appel's *Chrestomathie*,
p. 12, 1692: Prenet drap de cansil e vair e gris.
7. Lo Coms de Poitiers, from *Manualetto Provensale*, Crescini,
p. 9, l. 42: E vair e gris e sembeli.
8. Peire d'Alvernhe, from Crescini (as above),
p. 221, no. 40: Nil dona vestirs vertz ni vars.
9. *Dit des Marcheans*, ed. Montaignon, Vol. V.
p. 124, l. 44: Et en maint estrange pais
Por querre laine et vair et gris.
10. p. 126, l. 126: Marchéans de peleterie d'ermine, de vair et de gris.
11. *Aucassin et Nicolette*, ed. Suchier,
638: et si va li ors et li argens et li vairs et li gris.
12. Same, 1070:
Vos ne me sarés ja demander or ni argent, cevaus ne palefrois ne
vair ne gris, ciens nê oisíax que je ne vos doinse.
13. *Protonopeus de Blois*, in description of the triple wedding,
l. 10790: La véíst tant bon garnement,
De rices palies de cendaus,

A or, à pieres, à esmaus
Et tant martines et ermins,
Et vair et gris et sebelins.

14. *Aimeri de Narbonne*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
l. 2553: De ver, de gris et d'ermine forrée.
15. Same,
l. 3265: Bien fu vestus et de ver et de gris.
16. Same,
l. 3276: Tant voi sor aus et de ver et de gris.
17. *Aiol et Mirabel*, ed. Förster,
l. 607: Asses portent avoir et vair et gris
Et argent et deniers et boin or fin.
18. Same,
l. 1575: Tant vi entor le roi et vair et gris.
19. Same,
l. 1583: Ja n'est mie li ceurs n'el vair n'el gris.
20. Same,
l. 1612: Puis en ot vair et gris et boin ceval.
21. Same,
l. 1641: Qui de vair et de gris sont tout aparellie.
22. Same,
l. 1934: Il en ot vair et gris et boin destrier.
23. *Roman de Troie*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
l. 26892: N'i remest or ne vair ne gris
Ne vin ne blé ne autre avoir.
24. Crestien de Troyes, *Le Chevalier au Lion*, cited from Bartsch's Chres.
col. 122, 295: Et avuec ce li aparaille
robe d'escarlade vermoille
de ver forrée a tot la croie.
25. *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Michel,
l. 9830: De vert ou d'escarlade achate
Et de vair et de gris la forrée.
26. Same,
l. 10014: Et commandés que l'on vous veste
De camelot, de vair, de gris.
27. *St. Thomas le Martyr*,
l. 779: Or ert simples et dux, despiscit vair et gris.
28. *Huon de Bordeaux*, ed. Guessard,
l. 4886: Ens le premiere troverés le vin cler:
Ens l'autre après vair et gris a asés.
29. Same,
l. 6714: Et vair et gris i misent li baron.
30. Same,
l. 7796: Abandoins vous les biens de mon ostel;
Le vair, le gris, les hermins engolé.
31. *Monstrelet*,
III, fol. 21: Chapperon d'escarlatte furriez de menu vair.

32. *La Panthere d'Amors*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
Avoit chascuns robe vestue
Et forrée de vair menu.
33. *Aiol*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
l. 2473: N'avés pelichon vair, gris ne hermine.
34. *Aimeri de Narbonne*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
l. 2593: Desfublé sont li mantel vair et gris.
35. Same,
l. 2669: Or soient vostre li mantel vair et gris.
36. *Roman de Troie*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
l. 1610: Une pelice vaire e grise.
37. Froissart, *Œuvres*,
II, II, 160: Ils sont fourrés de vaire et de gris et nous sommes vestus de
povres draps.

EXHIBIT C: Group II

1. *Dit de la Mort Lorguesce*, ed. A. Héron,
l. 79: D'une vielle pane forrée
De menu vair entrepelée.
2. *Miracle de Sainte Bantheuch (Les Miracles de Nostre Dame)*,
l. 953: Alez me querre appertement
Un garnement a penne vaire
Que pour ce voyage ay fait faire
Si m'en iray (being a speech of the king).
3. *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Michel,
l. 21932: De biaux dras de soie ou de laine,
Où moult a riches pennes mises,
Erminées, vaires ou grises.
4. Same,
l. 215: Ou mantiau n'ot penne vaire.
5. *Partonopeus de Blois*,
l. 10633: Gaudins ot bone vestéure,
Et bien taillié à se mesure:
Penne vaire, pelise grise.
6. *Philomena*, cited from Raynouard:
Gonelhas folradas de penas vayras amb erminis.
7. *Flamenca*, ed. Meyer,
l. 3410: Ab penas vairas, bella e genta.
8. Same.
l. 3493: Puis li det bellas pennas vairas.
9. Marcabru, ed. Dejeanne,
No. XI, Stanza 6: Tan tem quecs que falla trama
Per qu'en lur cortz non es visa
Copa ni enaps d'argent,
Mantells vairs ni pena griza.

EXHIBIT C: Group III

1. *Fabliaux et Contes*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
p. 345: Et il vestent les robes vaires.
2. *Yvain*, ed. Förster,
l. 4358: Par son consoil nos reuerto
Ma dame de ses robes veires.
3. *Eric et Enide*, same,
l. 2145: Mainte en i ot d'autre afere,
Mainte bandée et mainte vere.
4. *Yvain*, same,
l. 233: Et m'afubla un chier mantel
Ver d'escarlate peonace
Et tuit nos guerpirent la place.
5. *Eric et Enide*, same,
l. 1574: Li vost doner robe d'ermine,
De dras de soie veire ou grise.
6. *L'Escoufle*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
l. 1877: La gentix dame debonnaire
A cascun done reube vaire
As festes anveus, qui que faille.
7. Same.
l. 7048: Ele estoit toute desliie
En. I. fres vair pliçon sans mences.
8. Same,
l. 7808: Cele a la bele tresce sore
Qui estoit en biau pliçon ver
Onques en cele nuit d'iver
N'ot plus vestu fors sa chemise.
9. *Les Vers de la Mort*, par Hélinant, Moine de Froidmont, Soc. des anc.
text. fr., 53, l. :
Morz fait valoir et sac et haire
Autant com porpre et robe vaire.
10. *Roman Anonyme*, Constans, *Chrestomathie*,
p. 100, no. 33, l. 29: Ne sor mon cors n'avra pelice vaire.
11. *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Michel,
l. 6005: Que li rois o sa robe vaire.
12. Marcabru, as cited above in Group II, last item,
Mantells vairs ni pena griza.
13. In description of the dressing of Partonopeus by Urake,
5062: Et un cort peliçonet gris
Et d'un bon vert corte gonele,
Li a vestu la damoisele.
14. Partonopeus de Blois,
5083: Puis li asfuble son mantel,
De bon vert et de gris novel.

EXHIBIT D

(Citations in which *vair* is used to describe eyes)

1. *Chanson de Roland*, ed. Gautier,
l. 304: Vairs out les oïls e mult fier le visage.
2. *Le Roman de Roncevaux*,
l. (?): Ver et los els.
3. *Raoul de Cambrai*, extract in *Chrestomathie du Moyen Age*, Gaston Paris.
l. 341: Sa bele boche li prent a estrechier
Et si vair ueil prenent a espessier.
4. Marie de France, *Equitan*,
l. 35: Les uiz out vairs e bel le vis,
bele buche, nes bien asis
les chevels blonz e reluisanz
El reialme n'aveit sa per.
5. Same, *Guingamor*,
l. 415: Les uiz vairs e la bele buche.
(This is where Guingamor recalls the charms of his lady.)
6. Same, *Lanfal*,
l. 570: Le col plus blanc que neif sur branche
les uiz ot vair e blanc le vis
bele buche, nez bien asis
les surcilz brun e bel le frunt
e le chief cresp e alkes blunt
fils d'or ne gete tel leur
cum si chevel cuntre le jur.
(This is the description of the fairy as she rides to rescue Lanfal.)
7. Gautier de Dargies, Soc. des anc. text. fr. (Poem addressed to Gace Brulé.)
VI, l. 15: A en li toutes beautez
Les vis est frès couloureuz,
Ex vairs, bouche bien assise
Cors qui m'alume et atise.
8. Raoul de Houdaing, *Vengeance Raguidel*, ed. Friedwagner, Halle, 1891.
l. 2093: Et les iols vairs et le vis cler
Con s'il fust fais por esgarder.
9. Roman de Troie, Soc. des anc. text. fr., vol. 52,
l. 5171: Patroclus ot le cors mout gent
E mout fu de grent esciënt.
Blans fu e blonz e lons e granz
E chevaliers mout avenanz:
Les ieux ot vairs, n'ot pas grant ire.
10. Same,
l. 5519: Andromache fu bele e gente
E plus blanche que n'est flor d'ente;
Blois fu sis chiés e vair si uel:
11. Same,
l. 30010: Les ieux ot vairs e le chief blont;
Le nez e la boche e le front
Ot si bien estanz e si beaus (of Circe).
12. Same,
l. : Les ieux ot vairs, le vis joios
De barbe e de cheveus fu ros.

13. *Aucassin et Nicolette*, Suchier ed.,
21, 10: Et le mescine au corset
qui avoit le poil blondet,
cler le vis et l'oeil vairet.
(Shepherd's description of Nicolette.)
14. Same,
23, 13: Vo vair oeil et vos gens cors
Vos biax ris et vos dox mos.
(As Aucassin recalls Nicolette.)
15. *Tristan*, ed. Michel,
l. 2853: Les eulz out vers, les cheveus sors.
16. Same,
l. 2842: Qui molt par ert vairs et joiaus.
17. *Li Jus Adan, ou de la Fewillie*, Adan de la Halle, cited from Bartsch's
Chrestomathie, no. 76,
p. 247, l. 100: Si noir oeil me sanloient vair.
18. *Prise de Cordres*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
l. 590: Vairs ot les iolz et les chevoux ot blons.
19.
l. 2166: De ses vers oïlz commença a plorer.
20. *Rondeaux de Guillaume d'Amiens*, cited from Bartsch's *Chrestomathie*, no. 76,
p. 222, l. 1-3: Ja mais ne serai saous
D'esgarder les vairs ieux dous
Qui m'ont ocis.
21. *Aimeri de Narbonne*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
l. 2536: Les eux ot vers la face colorée.
22. Same,
l. 3268: Vers ot les eux, cler et riant le vis
Plus bele dame ne vit hom qui soit vis.
23. Pastourelle Anonyme, Bartsch, *Chrestomathie*, no. 62, p. 215,
l. 9: Je suis sade et brunete
Et joenne pucelete
S'ai color vermeillete
Eux verz, bele bouchete.
24. *Chastelaine de Saint Gille*, vol. I of the *Fabliaux* ed. by Montaiglon, p. 138,
st. 12: De ma dame ai. I. douz penser
Dont je ne puis mon cuer oster,
Adés i pens en regardant,
Si vair oeil vont mon cuer ardant.
.
En regardant m'ont si vair oeil
Donez les maus dont je me dueil.
25. *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Michel,
l. 808: La face avoit com une pomme,
Cointes fu et de bel atour.
Les yex ot vair, la bouche gente,
Et le nez fait par grant entente;
Cheveus ot blons . . .
Chaucer's trans., Oxford ed.,
l. 819: As round as appel was his face,

Ful rody and whyt in every place.
 Fetys he was and wel beseye,
 With metely mouth and yēn greye;
 His nose by mesure wrought ful right;
 Crisp was his heer and eek ful bright.

26. Same,

l. 1579: C'est li miréoirs périlleus,
 Où Narcisus li orgueilleus
 Mira sa face et ses yex vers.

Chaucer,

l. 1601: This is the miroir perilous,
 In which the proude Narcissus
 Saw al his face fair and bright.

27. *Chansons, Ballades et Rondeaux*, Jehannot de Lescurel, Bib. Elz., ed. Montaiglon, no. 1:

A vous douce débonaire,
 Ai mon cuer donné
 Ja n'en partiré.
 Vo vaire euil m'i font atraire.

28. Ste. Palaye cites from MS. from which the above is taken,

Bonnement m'agrés de vous amer blondette
 Doucete, savoureuse et vos ieux vair.

But in the edition above quoted the same passage runs thus:

Bonnement m'agrée
 Vous amer, blondette
 Doucette
 Et vos cors veir.

Montaiglon considers this MS. unique; so that Ste. Palaye could not have corrected the reading by another, unless indeed he knew of one now unknown.

29. Grand. Cron. de France, IV, 24, P. cited by Godefroy:

Il avoit les yeux vair et les cheveux blonds.

30. Froissart, *Meliador*, Société des Anciens Textes Français, 35:

Vo vair oel, simple et attraiant.

31. In Froissart's *Chronicles*, vol. II (*Œuvres de Froissart*, Bruxelles, 1870), p. 80, is the account of his visit at Orthais where he was the guest of Gaston Phebus, Count of Foix, Béarn, etc., of whom he says: "... je n'en veis onques nul qui feust de si beaulx membres ... sanguin et riant, les yeulx vers et amoureux là où il luy plaisoit son regard jeter. De toutes choses il estoit si parfait et tant appris que on ne le pavoit trop loer."

32. *Miracles de Nostre Dame*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.

l. 262: La belle qui tant a ver oeil
 M'a fait present de son gent corps
 Et sommes en certains accors.

33. Deschamps, *virelay*, no. 5, in Lucas, *Oxford Book of French Verse*,

J'ay vers yeulx, petits sourcis,
 Le chief blond, le nex traitis,
 Ront menton, blanche gorgette;
 Sui je, sui je, sui je belle?

34. Same, Soc. des anc. text. fr. (3d vol. of works of Deschamps), p. 267:

De vos vers yeux, de votre doulx visaige.

35. Same,
vol. 8: Et le regart de deux vairs oeulx.
36. Marot, Clément, Œuvres (ed. 1731, à la Haye), Chants Divers, vol. II,
p. 55: *De L'Amour Fugitif*:
Le propre jour que Venus aux yeux verts
Parmi le monde allot chanter ces vers.
37. Same,
vol. I, p. 167: *Dialogue de deux Amoureux*.
Quant les petits vilotieres
Trouvent quelque hardy Amant,
Qui vuille mettre un dyament
Devant leurs yeux rians et vers.
38. Same, Etrennes:
La duchesse de Nevers
Aux yeux vers
Pour l'esprit qui est en elle
Aura louenge eternelle
Par mon vers.
39. Ronsard, vol. I,
sonnet xxvi: Plustost les cieux de mer seront couvers,
Plustost sans forme ira confes le monde
Que je sois serf d'une maistresse blonde,
Ou que j'adore une femme aux yeux vers
Car cet œil brun qui vint premier éteindre
etc.
40. Same, book V,
Ode II: Ne te dira femme mortelle
Mais sœur de Pallas aux yeux vers.
41. La Fontaine, *Filles de Minée* (speaking of Minerva),
Tout le Monde entourait la déesse aux yeux vers.
42. Poem attributed variously to Pujols and to Blacassetz, no. 84 in Appel's
Chrestomathie:
l. 17: E que faran vair huelh ni blancas dens?
43. Peire d'Alvernhe describes a lady as
plus de doussor, vertz e blancas, cum es nics,
but he does not help us to distribute these adjectives.
44. Arnautz de Marueil, in Crescini, *Manualetto Provensale*, p. 38,
l. 89: Las vostras belas sauras cris
El vostre fron plus blanc que lis
Les vostres olhs vairs e rizens.
45. *Roman de Flamenca*,
l. 1583: Lo pol ac blon, cresp et undat
l. 1587: Oils ac grosses, vars e risenz.
46. *Partonopeus de Blois*,
l. 553: Cevals ot si beaus et si blois, . . .
Les iols a gros, vairs et rians. (Description of Partonopeus)
47. Same,
l. 3987: Cevals a blois, front large et blanc
Iols gros et vairs, vis cler et franc.
(Description of princess of France.)

48. Same,
l. 4870: A cevels blois . . .
A iols vairs gros et segnorius. (Description of Urrake.)
49. Same,
l. 6290: Ses beaus iols vairs et son cler vis. (Description of Persewis.)
50. Same,
l. 7500: Cis cevaliers sanble un petit,
De beaus iols vairs et de façon.
(Where P.'s lady comes near recognizing him.)
51. Gace Brulé, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
chanson 51: Mi ueil n'en font pas a blasmer
Li sien m'ont mort, he Deus, coment?
Ne sont il vair, riant et cler?
52. Raoul de Houdaing, *Le Songe d'Enfer*, cited by Ste. Palaye fr. MS. 7218,
f. 80, Bib. Nat. old no.: Vairs yeux rians et fendus.
53. Chansons du Chatelain de Coucy, Bartsch's *Chrestomathie*, p. 162,
l. 11: Mais ses douz vis et sa bele bouchete
Et si bel oel vair et riant et cler
M'orent ainz pris que m'osasse doner.
54. Roman de Thèbes, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
l. 955: Onque Pallas ne Diana
La lor beauté ne sormonta
Ne sont petits ne trop granz.

Cheveus out blois, lons et deugiez
Si lor ataignent jusqu'as piez;
Ses fronz aperz et hanz et blans
Bien eschieves par les flans;
Les ueuz out vairs et amouros,
Ainc hom ne vit tant merveillous.
55. *Roman de Troie*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.
a l. 5547 (of Polixenain):
Le chief ot bloi, les cheveus lons,
Qui li passoënt les talons;
Les ieux clers, vairs e amors
Les sorciz deugiez ambedous
La face blanche, cler le vis,
Plus que rose ne flor de lis.

b l. 17557 (also of Polixenain):
Ses tres beaus ieux vairs e son front
E son bel chief, qu'ele a si blont
Que fins ors ressemble esmerez.
56. *Aucassin et Nicolette*, Suchier ed.,
2, 12: Il avoit les caviax blons et menus recerclés et les ex vairs et rians et
le face clere et traitice et le nes haut et bien assis. (Description of
Aucassin.)
57. Same,
12, 19: Ele avoit les caviaus blons et menus recerclés et les ex vairs et rians
et le face traitise et le nes haut et bien assis et lavretes vremelletes plus que
n'est cerisse ne rose el tans d'esté, et les dens blans et menus.

58. Same,
 15, 8: Vairs les ex, ciere riant.
 Paris translates this passage,
 les yeux vifs,
 Child, Rich, thy laughing eyes regard.
59. Wace, *Conception*, cited by Godefroy fr. British Museum Add.,
 15606, f. 39b: Les eazu avoit vers et rianz.
60. Motet in Constans, *Chrestomathie*, p. 100, no. 34-2,
 l. 14: Eux vairs rians, bruns sorcis
 Et voutis
 Biau nes traitis,
 Bouche vermeille, dens drus petis.
61. XIII C.
Motets Anonymes, Bartsch 66, p. 222,
 l. 7: Sa fresce bouce riant,
 Ki tous jors dit par samblant
 "Baisies, baisies moi, amis,
 Toudis!"
 Son nés bien fait a devis,
 Et si vair oel souriant,
 Larron d'ambler cuer d'amant,
 Et si brun sourcil plaisant . . . etc.
62. *Régime du Corps* de Maître A. de Siennne, Texte Fr., du XIII S.
 p. 195: *Des iex qui sont gros, ou*
 Li enseignement des iaus.
 Ki a les iex gros et grans et tranblans, si est lens, et de grande vie, et
 ameros de femmes. Cil qui les a vairs et mellés aussi com à colour de
 safron est mal acostumés et de male nature . . . Cil qui ont les iex noirs et
 un pou vair, et ne sont rouge, ains sont cler luisant c'est signe de bone nature
 et bien acostumée et sage, car c'est li mellor oel qui soient.
63. *Les Dits de Huē Archevesque*, ed. Héron, 1885,
 (De La Mort Lorguece),
 l. 59: Ot vairs iex, rianz et fendus.
64. *l'Amant rendu Cordelier*, Soc. des anc. text. fr., 19,
 a. l. 1521: Doux yeux, moitié blans, moitié vers.
 b. l. 1577: " " aussy vers que genesvre.
65. *Guillaume au Faucon*, vol. II of *Fabliaux*, ed. Montaiglon, p. 95,
 l. 120: Sorciz brunez et large entr'ueil;
 En la teste furent li oeil
 Clair et riant, vair et fendu.
66. *Œuvres de René Regnault et Jeanneton*, vol. II,
 p. 129: Avec ses gens et tres plaisans yeulx vers,
 Si regarda le pasteur.
67. *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Michel,
 l. 849: Les sorcis bruns et enarchiés,
 Les yex gros et si envoisiés,
 Qu'il rioient toujours avant
 Que la bouchete par convent.
 The same in Chaucer's tr.,
 l. 861: Bente were hir brows two,

Hir yën greye, and gladde also,
That laughed ay in hir semblaunt
First or the mouth, by covenaut.

(This of Gladnesse) :

The French here is *gros*, but it is not unlikely that the copy which Chaucer used had *vair*. This is a matter which can hardly be sifted until the large number of MSS. of the *Roman de La Rose* have been collated and a satisfactory constitution of the text made.

68. *Roman de la Rose*,

l. 1197: Apres tous ceus se tint Franchise,
Qui ne fu brune ne bise,
Ains ere blanche comme nois,
Et si n'ot pas nés d'Orlenois,
Ainçois l'avoit lonc et traitis,
Iex vairs, rians, sorcis votis;
S'ot les chevous et bons et lons
Et fu simple comme uns coulons.

The same in Chaucer,

l. 1211: And next him daunced dame Fraunchyse.
Arrayed in ful noble gyse.
She was not broun ne dun of hewe,
But whyt as snow y-fallen newe.
Hir nose was wrought at poynt devys,
For it was gentil and tretys;
With eyen gladde, and browes bente;
Hir heer down to hir heles wente.
And she was simple as dowve on tree,
Ful debonaire of herte was she.

69. Christine de Pisan, *Rondeau*, Lucas, *Oxford Book of French Verse*, no. 14,
l. 1, 7 and 12: Rians vairs yeulz, qui mon cuer avez pris.

70. *Roman d'Alexandre*, episode of the Flower maidens, taken from Bartsch's
Chrestomathie, not located in the complete text.

Celes ont clers les vis plus que n'est flor de prés,
Les ious vairs et rians plus que faucons müés.

Lamprecht has:

Ih ne sach nie von wibe
Scöner antluzze mê,
Noh ougen alsô wol stê.

71. *Dit de la Mort Larguesce*, in *Dits de Huë Archevesque*, ed. Héron, 1885,
l. 2853: Ieus vairs come un faucon muez.

72. *La Prise de Cordres*, Soc. des anc. text. fr.

l. 711: Vars out les iolz con .I. falcon mué.

73. l. 718: Same as 711.

74. l. 1923: Vairs ot les oilz comme faulcon mué.

75. Vol. IV of Percy Soc. Pub. (MS. Harl. no. 2253) about A. D. 1307. Anony-
mous poem, no. I:

Femmes portent les oyls veyrs,
e regardent come faucon;

This is the only use I find of the word *vair* in this book.

76. *Roman de la Rose*, ed Michel,

l. 525: Le guichet . . .
M'ovrit une noble pucele

Qui moult estoit et gente et bele
Cheveus ot blons com uns bacins
La char plus tendre qu' uns pocins,
Front reluisant, sorcis votis.
Son entr' oil ne fu pas petis,
Ains iert assez grans par mesure.
Le nés ot bien fait à droiture;
Les yex ot plus vairs c'uns faucons,
Por faire envie à ces bricons.

Same in Chaucer's translation, Frag. A, line 537, of *Ydelnesse*,

l. 537: Til that the dore of thilke entree
A mayden curteys opened me.
Hir heer was as yelowe of hewe
As any basin scoured newe.
Hir flesh as tendre as is a chicke
With bente browes, smothe and slike;
And by mesure large were
The opening of hir yēn clere.
Hir nose of good proporcioun,
Hir yēn greye as a faucoun,
With swete breeth and wel savoured.

77. *Sir Ferumbras*, E. E. Text Soc., no. 34, description of Floripas,

a. p. 182, l. 5881: Wyd eyene graye, and browes bent.

b. *Fierabras*, Anc. Poètes de la France, vol. 4, description of Floripas,

l. 2007: Moult par ot gent le cors, escevi et molé
La car ot tenre et blance comme flour en esté
La face vermellete comme rose de pré;
La bouce petitete, et li dent sont seré,
Ki plus estoient blanc k'ivoire replané.
Les levres ot grossetes, dou rouge i ot assés,
Le nes ot bien séant, le front bel et plané,
Les ex vairs et rians plus d'un faucon mué.

c. The same description occurs in the Provençal at line 2020 ff.

d. In the Italian, V, V, 1: La bella Fierapace.

I, IV, 4: Same.

IV, XXIX, 1: mia sorella la bella Fierapace.

There is no description of the lady's eyes in the Italian.

e. *Destruction de Rome, Romania*, 1873,

l. 254: Ses crins sur ces espaules plus luroient d'or mier
Sa char out bel e blank plus que noifs en fevrier
Les oes avoit plus noirs que falcon monteniet.

78. *Vraye histoire comique de Françon*, ed. 1641, Rouen. Sorel, Book III, p. 219:

Et quelquesfois il me venoit en l'imagination que i estois le mesme
Demoisel qui basoit une Gorgiasse Infante qui avoit les yeux verts
comme un faucon.

(Gorgiasse Infante, "glorious princess," but probably in equivocal sense.)

79. *De Gombert et des II Cleris*, vol. I, of *Fabliaux*, ed. Montaiglon, p. 238,

l. 10: Quar la dame est mingnote et cointe;
Les iex ot vair come cristal.

80. *Miracles de Nostre Dame*, Soc. des anc. text. fr., vol. IV, p. 123, a prose sermon preceding the text:

Quel roy? celui qui donne le bougeran de continence, la pourpre
de patience, le pers de penitence, le vert d'abstinence, l'escarlate de
martire, et le vair d'onesté, c'est l'amoureux Jhesus.

CONSTANTINOPLE.

MURIEL KINNEY

THE TEACHING OF FRENCH IN COLONIAL NEW YORK

STRANGE as it may seem, no thorough investigation has been made of instruction in the French language during the colonial period. Histories, and special contributions to the history of American education, either do not mention the matter, or they give the impression that the study of French did not become general until the Revolution. The conclusion that French did not appear in the North until the Revolution has been reached more or less syllogistically. The fact is, the growing friendly relationship between France and America helped greatly to extend the popularity of a language *already established* as "polite and necessary." But the importance of that period must not be overestimated in a study of origins. Neither New York nor any other northern colony had to wait for the Revolution and its subsequent influence to make instruction in French popular.

In New York City instruction in French was given as early as 1735. In that year the following unsigned advertisement appeared in the *New York Gazette*:

"This is to give Notice that over against the Sign of the black Horse in Smith-street, near the old Dutch Church, is carefully taught the French and Spanish Languages, after the best Method that is now practised in Great Britain which for the encouragement of those who intend to learn the same is taught for 20s per Quarter.

"Note, that the said Person teaches Reading, Writing and Arithmetick, at very reasonable Terms, which is per Quarter for Readers 5s. for Writers 8s. for Cypherers 1s."¹

Two years later, "John Hastier, Goldsmith in this City," announced that there was at his "House a Frenchman, who teaches to Read and Write French, as also Arithmetick in a very short Method."²

The records indicate that there were two types of schools in which French was taught. One, to which the earliest advertise-

¹ *N. Y. Gazette*, July 14-21, July 21-28, July 28-Aug. 4, 1735.

² *N. Y. Weekly Journal*, June 27, July 4, July 25, Aug. 1, 1737.

ments refer, offered instruction in other subjects as well. In the other, tuition was given in French only.

Schools of the first type may be represented by the one mentioned in the advertisement of 1735 set out in the preceding paragraph. Here we find a master advertising "the French and Spanish Languages," and "Reading, Writing and Arithmetick." In the school to which reference is made in the advertisement of 1737, instruction was given in "Arithmetick." Augustus Vaughan, in 1747, taught "English, Latin, French, Spanish and Italian,"³ and John Clarke, in 1749, "Reading, Writing, Vulgar and Decimal Arithmetick, the Extraction of the Square and Cube Root, Navigation, Surveying, French and Spanish. . . . Book-keeping after the true Italian Method."⁴ In Michael Christian Knoll's school, of 1750, French was offered in combination with "Latin . . . Greek, and Hebrew, and Philosophy, and . . . Merchant's Accounts after the Italian Fashion."⁵ Advertisements of the years 1750-1783 indicate that such schools were numerous during the last three decades of the colonial period. Not only were they in greater demand, but most schoolmasters could not afford to teach one subject only.

As we may expect, there were relatively few schools in which French alone was taught. Some of these were patronised by adults only; in others, there were separate classes for adults and children. A notice of May 31, 1756, informs us "That Peter Durand, lately from Holland, intends to teach Gentlemen and Ladies to read and write French."⁶ William Clajon, in 1761, announced that "He takes no Children. . . . He . . . undertakes to teach no others, but such as are both willing and capable of Improvement and is determined not to sacrifice his Honour and Character, either to the Caprice of Children or to the Lavishness of some Parents."⁷

Although the terms "school," and "academy," appear frequently in the advertisements, the average master kept school "at his house." Reinhold Jan Klockhoff, in 1751, taught "at the House of Mr.

³ *N. Y. Gazette*. Revived in the *Weekly Post Boy*, Oct. 26, 1747.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Dec. 4, Dec. 11, Dec. 18, 1749; *Ibid.*, Jan. 1, 1750. John Clarke styled himself "Philomath."

⁵ *Ibid.*, Aug. 6, Aug. 13, 1750.

⁶ *N. Y. Gazette* or *Weekly Post Boy*, May 31, 1756.

⁷ *N. Y. Mercury*, Nov. 2, 1761.

Bratt, wherein the Widow of Mr. J. P. Zenger now lives, upon Golden-Hill, in New York."⁸ In 1752 John Baptiste Guerbois gave instruction in French "at Mr. Bury's Tailor in Beaver Street."⁹ William Clajon, in 1761, opened "his School at the House of Mrs. Boskirk . . . in Dock Street,"¹⁰ and in 1764, "at the House of Mr. Samuel Israel over against the Queen's Head Tavern."¹¹ On May 19, 1766, he announced that "the Minister and Elders of the French Church, desirous to encourage a French-School, have granted me Leave to teach in their Consistory Room, situate in the Yard of that Church."¹² The Rev. Mr. Frederick Rothenbuhler, in 1762, seems to have kept a more pretentious establishment, a "French Boarding School," in which "young Gentlemen and Ladies may be boarded by him, agreeable to their Rank; to instruct them in whatever is necessary for the finishing of their Education."¹³ Many French boarding-schools appeared in New York City, during the third quarter of the eighteenth century. In 1774 Anthony Fiva announced that he "would be glad to take a couple of single gentlemen, willing to learn or improve themselves in the above languages."¹⁴

⁸ *N. Y. Gazette*. Revived in the *Weekly Post Boy*, April 22, 1751.

Ibid., Aug. 26, Sept. 2, Sept. 16, Sept. 23, 1751. Jan Paulus Ostome: "in the House of the Rev. Mr. Ebenezer Pemberton in Stone-street."

⁹ *N. Y. Gazette*. Revived in the *Weekly Post Boy*, Nov. 6, Nov. 27, 1752.

N. Y. Gazette or *Weekly Post Boy*, Nov. 26, Dec. 3, 1753. John Lewis Mayor: "At Mrs. Favieres, near the Long-Bridge."

N. Y. Gazette and *Weekly Mercury*, Jan. 29, Feb. 5, Feb. 12, Oct. 1, Oct. 8, 1770. John Girault: "At the Widow Sarah Horner opposite the Seceders Meeting House."

Ibid., July 22, Aug. 19, 1771. Michael Bechades: "At his Academy at the Widow Hayes . . . in Dock-street."

¹⁰ *N. Y. Mercury*, Jan. 26, Nov. 2, 1761.

¹¹ *N. Y. Gazette* or *Weekly Post Boy*, Oct. 25, Nov. 1, Nov. 15, Nov. 22, 1764.

¹² *N. Y. Mercury*, May 19, May 26, 1766.

¹³ *N. Y. Gazette* or *Weekly Post Boy*, July 8, 1762.

N. Y. Gazette and *Weekly Mercury*, Jan. 14, Jan. 21, Jan. 28, Feb. 4, Feb. 11, 1771. J. and M. Tanner: "Young Ladies boarded on reasonable Terms."

Rivington's *N. Y. Gazetteer*, or Connecticut, New Jersey, Hudson's River, and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, April 21, April 28, 1774. Simeon and Catherine Lugin: "Boarding and Day School for young ladies."

Ibid., July 21, 1774. Mrs. Cozani: "A French Boarding School."

N. Y. Journal or the *General Advertiser*, Feb. 17, 1774. J. Peter Tetard: "French Boarding School."

¹⁴ *Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer*, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, May 19, May 26, 1774.

Information concerning the qualifications of the masters is fairly abundant. Many of them were Frenchmen,¹⁵ and advertised themselves as "natives of France,"¹⁶ or as "just arrived here from Paris."¹⁷ A schoolmaster of 1757 called attention to the fact that he had "made his Tour through France."¹⁸ Thomas Egan, in 1780, advertised that his "residence for many years in some of the first computing-houses in France enables him to assure those Gentlemen and Ladies who please to receive his instructions that they will not be disappointed in his abilities."¹⁹ Advertisements of another form announced that certain masters had "taught the French Language in this City," or elsewhere, "for a few Years."²⁰ The Rev. J. Peter Tetard, in 1774, assumed that his "Character and Capacity are well known, he having lived with Credit in the City of New York for upwards of fifteen Years; So that Gentlemen who will entrust him

¹⁵ *N. Y. Weekly Journal*, June 27, July 4, July 25, Aug. 1, 1737.

Names like Bechades, Clajon, De La Roche, Durand, Girault, Guerbois, Haumaid, Lugin, Philipse, Teniere, and Tetard appear frequently in the advertisements.

¹⁶ *Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer*, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, April 21, April 28, 1774.

N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury, Jan. 29, Feb. 5, Feb. 12, Oct. 1, Oct. 8, 1770. "John Girault, A Native of France, lately arrived in this City."

N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post Boy, May 18, 1772. "A Gentleman, Native of Paris."

¹⁷ *N. Y. Gazette*. Revived in the *Weekly Post Boy*, Nov. 6, Nov. 27, 1752. "John Baptiste Guerbois just arrived here from Paris."

N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury, July 22, Aug. 19, 1771. "Michael Bechades from Paris."

¹⁸ *N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post Boy*, Oct. 17, Oct. 24, Nov. 21, Nov. 28, Dec. 19, 1757.

¹⁹ *N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, Jan. 10, 1780.

Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, July 22, Aug. 12, Dec. 9, Dec. 16, 1773. Anthony Fiva "resided many years in Paris and Madrid."

²⁰ *N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, March 2, 1772. Francis Humbert De La Roche.

Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, Dec. 22, 1774. Anthony Fiva, "for these two years past has taught the French, Spanish, and Italian languages in this City constantly with equal Success."

Ibid., Oct. 26, Nov. 9, Nov. 16, 1775. Francis Vandale "taught French and other languages with good success, in Boston and Newport in Rhode Island."

with the Education of their Children may depend on their Expectations being properly answered."²¹

Some of the masters appear to have been well qualified morally and intellectually. As may be expected, a few of them were ministers or ex-ministers.²² In 1770 John Girault, "A Native of France," advised "the Public" that "He has brought with him ample Certificates of his Character, from the Consistory of a Protestant Congregation at Poitou in France, where he was an Elder, and from the Consistory of a French Church in London where he resided for several Years."²³ William Clajon, in 1761, "in order to satisfy those Gentlemen and Ladies who desire to be taught the French Language grammatically; and with a true Pronunciation," was "examined at the College in this City by the Revd. Mr. Carle Minister of the French Church and the Revd. Mr. Testart, another French Minister, in the Presence of the Revd. Doctor Johnson, President of the College, and fully satisfied them of his Capacity."²⁴ An unknown master of 1772 advertised himself as "A Gentleman, Native of Paris, who took the Degree of Master of Arts at that University, and lately taught in Nassau Hall, New Jersey."²⁵ Anthony Fiva, who taught French, Spanish, and Italian, in New York City, during the years 1772-1775, also "had an academical educa-

²¹ *N. Y. Journal or the General Advertiser*, Feb. 17, 1774.

²² *N. Y. Gazette*. Revived in the *Weekly Post Boy*, Aug. 6, Aug. 13, 1750. Michael Christian Knoll, former "Minister of the Lutheran Church here."

N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post Boy, Nov. 26, Dec. 3, 1753. "the Rev'd John Lewis Mayor."

Ibid., July 8, 1762. "The Rev. Mr. Frederic Rothenbuhler, Minister of the Switzer Church."

N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury, Sept. 7, Sept. 14, Oct. 5, 1772. "the Revd. J. Peter Tetard, late Minister of the Reformed French Church in this City." Tetard's advertisement appears again in the *N. Y. Journal or General Advertiser*, Feb. 17, 1774, and in *Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer*, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, May 4, June 1, June 15, June 22, June 29, July 13, 1775.

²³ *N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, Jan. 29, Feb. 5, Feb. 12, Oct. 1, Oct. 8, 1770.

²⁴ *N. Y. Mercury*, Jan. 26, Nov. 2, 1761. Reference is made to King's College, later Columbia.

²⁵ *N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post Boy*, May 18, 1772. Princeton.

tion."²⁶ John Haumaid, in 1772, thought "it unnecessary to say anything respecting his abilities as a teacher, as the bare mention of his having under his tuition the principal students of King's College, as well as a number of ladies and gentlemen who before made some advances in this polite language, together with his having a regular education fully bespeaks his abilities as a teacher of the same."²⁷

The newspapers contain a brief but fairly adequate statement of the aim of instruction in these schools. William Clajon's "design," of 1761, was "to perform within Six Months what he promises to do, viz., to give a true Pronunciation to his Scholars, to enable them to translate French into English, and English into French, so as to fit them to improve afterwards without any other Help, than the Method he will advise them to take."²⁸ Anthony Fiva, in 1773, proposed to "entirely ground them in the true accent . . . and all the rules of the syntax."²⁹

Our description of the methods of teaching French must be somewhat incomplete. Only a few of the advertisements indicate the methods employed, and the fragmentary nature of the material leaves much to be inferred. Most of the masters announced merely that they would teach the language "correctly and expeditiously,"³⁰ "in the most expeditious Manner,"³¹ or "in the most perfect and easy manner."³² An unknown master, in 1735, taught French

²⁶ *Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer*, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, July 22, Aug. 12, Dec. 9, Dec. 16, 1773. Fiva "is therefore able to resolve any question that might puzzle his scholars."

²⁷ *N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, Sept. 21, 1772.

²⁸ *N. Y. Mercury*, Jan. 26, Nov. 2, 1761.

²⁹ *Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer*, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, July 22, Aug. 12, Dec. 9, Dec. 16, 1773.

³⁰ *N. Y. Gazette*. Revived in the *Weekly Post Boy*, Oct. 26, 1747.

N. Y. Gazette or *Weekly Post Boy*, July 8, 1762. "The Rev. Mr. Frederic Rothenbuhler . . . continues teaching young Gentlemen and Ladies the Latin and French Languages as usual, with great Facility, in a short Time, to the utmost possible Perfection."

³¹ *N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, Sept. 7, Sept. 14, Oct. 5, 1772.

N. Y. Journal or the *General Advertiser*, Feb. 17, 1774.

N. Y. Weekly Journal, June 27, July 2, July 25, Aug. 1, 1737. "In a very short Method."

N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury, July 22, Aug. 19, 1771. "In the most elegant and expeditious Manner."

³² *Ibid.*, Jan. 10, Jan. 17, 1780.

"after the best Method that is now practised in Great Britain";³³ and Anthony Fiva, in 1774, "after the manner of academies, universities, and colleges of the learned world."³⁴ John Philipse, in 1758, assured his students that they "may depend upon being taught in the most Modern and Expeditious Method, and according to Mr. Paillaret's System; who had the Honour of teaching the Royal Family."³⁵ Michael Bechades, in 1771, had "a particular Method by which a Parson may in three Months speak it with ease."³⁶

More definitive information is supplied by Jan Paulus Ostome, in 1751, who taught "the French Language . . . according to the best Grammar Rules";³⁷ and John Girault, in 1773, "who instructs his pupils in all the variations of this polite tongue, after the rules of the most approved grammars, founded on the decisions of the Academy at Paris."³⁸ In Simeon and Catherine Lugin's "Boarding and Day School for young Ladies," of 1774, "the polite French language, which is constantly spoken in the family, being now-a-days part of the education of young ladies, will . . . be taught grammatically by Mr. and Mrs. Lugin, with that accent and pronunciation peculiar to the natives of France."³⁹ Mrs. Cozani, in the same year, taught her "young Ladies, . . . to write and translate one language into another."⁴⁰ William Clajon's notice of 1761 informs us that "not more than six nor less than four can be in a Class, and after a Class has begun, another Person cannot be taken into it, as it would retard the Progress of the Rest."⁴¹ In 1766 he announced that "My method shall be varied so as to suit the learner's views, age, &c. taking care to give but few rules properly exemplified."⁴²

³³ *N. Y. Gazette*, July 14-21, July 21-28, July 28-Aug. 4, Aug. 4-11, 1735.

³⁴ *Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer*, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, Dec. 22, 1774.

³⁵ *N. Y. Gazette* or *Weekly Post Boy*, Jan. 30, Feb. 6, Feb. 20, March 6, 1758.

³⁶ *N. Y. Gazette* and *Weekly Mercury*, July 22, Aug. 19, 1771.

³⁷ *N. Y. Gazette*. Revived in the *Weekly Post Boy*, Aug. 26, Sept. 2, Sept. 16, Sept. 23, 1751.

³⁸ *Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer*, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, Sept. 16, Sept. 23, Oct. 7, Oct. 14, 1773.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, April 21, April 28, 1774.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, July 21, 1774.

⁴¹ *N. Y. Mercury*, Jan. 26, Nov. 2, 1761.

⁴² *Ibid.*, May 19, May 26, 1766.

The teaching methods of most masters included the use of books, although the advertisements make but few references to the matter. Michael Bechades, in 1771, informed prospective students that he had "the choicest set of French books of every kind."⁴³ Apparently, William Clajon (1761) got into difficulty during the first year of his teaching in New York City, because he was not supplied with certain texts. His embarrassment may be inferred from the following notice:

"William Clajon Who began last Winter to teach the French Language, in this City, having been disappointed on account of those books he thought best calculated from his method of teaching, and being told by all those he had been acquainted with that his not being properly encouraged was entirely owing to the above disappointment; Therefore in the daily Expectation of those books now imported in the late vessels by Mr. Rivington, he has continued here notwithstanding many inconveniences."⁴⁴

It may be appropriate, at this point, to reproduce a book-store advertisement of 1771:

"Those who teach, or want to learn the French Language, may be supplied at Noel and Hazard's Book-Store, next Door to the Merchant's Coffee House, with Boyer's and Perrin's Grammar, Chambaud's and do's Exercises, Perrin's Spelling Book, do's Guide, do's Vademecum, do's Verbs, being a Collection of French Verbs, both regular and irregular, disposed in one Sheet of Paper.

"Boyer's, D'Alembert's, and Nugent's Dictionaries, French Testaments, Epistolary Correspondence in French and English, Telemaque, Oeconomy of Human Life, etc."⁴⁵

From notices of earlier date, we learn that Boyer's French and English Dictionary, Boyer's Grammar, Chambaud's Grammar, Chambaud's Vocabulary, Rudiments and Exercises, and Rogissard's Grammar, were in use at the middle of the century.

Tuition fees were not uniform throughout the city. Unfortunately, for our purposes, most advertisements do not mention the rates. In some cases they may have been determined by agreement between masters and students. The type statement of terms may be

⁴³ *N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, July 22, Aug. 19, 1771.

⁴⁴ *N. Y. Mercury*, Nov. 2, 1761.

⁴⁵ *N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, Oct. 28, 1771.

illustrated by the following: "will agree on reasonable Terms,"⁴⁶ "at a very reasonable Price,"⁴⁷ and "on very moderate terms."⁴⁸ An unknown master of 1735 "taught the French and Spanish Languages . . . for 20s. per Quarter."⁴⁹ Francis Vandale, in 1775, taught "French and other languages . . . at very reasonable rates," i. e., £2 "a piece ($\frac{1}{2}$ entrance) a quarter."⁵⁰ In Mrs. Cozani's "French Boarding School," in 1774, the fee included all costs; "Ladies will be boarded and educated at forty pounds a year."⁵¹ William Clajon, in 1766, taught "for 24s. per Month, and 24s. entrance, those of riper Years who incline to learn the French Language."⁵² This, Clajon tells us, represents a reduction from his former rates; "His Friends having persuaded him that he might expect greater Encouragement, should he reduce his Price; he informs the Public, that he has accordingly reduced it, though a good Number of Scholars had agreed with him on the old Terms."⁵³ In another announcement of the same year, he "gives Notice" that "Gentlemen who will meet to the Number of five, to be taught together in one Class, will be taught still cheaper."⁵⁴ Custom demanded that all fees be paid in advance, but many of Clajon's students seem to have neglected this matter, and as a result he was unable to pay his own bills. He tells the story of his embarrassment in an advertisement of 1766. The account follows:

"Above five years ago, when I came to this City, every one of my scholars had agreed to pay each Month beforehand; but unfortunately, I have not strictly enforced that rule; the consequence was, that I have been arrested, when the money due me for teaching could have over-paid all my debts; and after a long confinement, and a

⁴⁶ *N. Y. Weekly Journal*, June 27, July 2, July 25, Aug. 1, 1737.

N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury, March 2, 1772. "On the most reasonable Terms."

⁴⁷ *N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post Boy*, July 8, 1762.

⁴⁸ *Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer*, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, Dec. 22, 1774.

⁴⁹ *N. Y. Gazette*, July 14-21, July 21-28, July 28-Aug. 4, Aug. 4-11, 1735.

⁵⁰ *Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer*, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, Oct. 26, Nov. 9, Nov. 16, 1775.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, July 21, 1774.

⁵² *N. Y. Mercury*, May 19, May 26, 1766.

⁵³ *N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post Boy*, Oct. 25, Nov. 1, Nov. 15, Nov. 22, 1764.

Ibid., May 12, May 22, 1766.

⁵⁴ *N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post Boy*, Feb. 6, 1766.

much longer time still before I could obtain a Letter of Licence, I was more encumbered than before, whilst those who were indebted to me, having left this City, I have lost even the most distant prospect of payment. I hope therefore, that far from being offended at my insisting now on the terms proposed five years ago, the judicious will approve the reasonableness and necessity of every Scholar's paying beforehand, each Month or Quarter, according as he agrees either by the Month or Quarter. The Custom is followed in most places abroad, and many are the good effects resulting from it.

"My ambition being to extricate myself by industry, and an unwearied application, from my present undeserved difficulties, the public may depend on my doing my utmost to deserve encouragement."⁵⁵

In some cases the masters may have found it necessary to supplement their incomes from tuition fees, by engaging in remunerative employments outside of school-hours. It is not unusual to find court officials, attorneys, merchants, and others employing teachers of languages as translators. John Clarke's advertisement of 1749 contains the information that French and Spanish were "translated and taught, and sufficient Security given to keep all Writings secret."⁵⁶ Thomas Ross, in 1754, announced that "translations are done from any of the aforesaid languages," *i. e.*, French, Low Dutch, and Latin.⁵⁷ From William Clajon's notice in 1764 we learn that "He translates English into French and French into English, and hopes that the many Gentlemen he has endeavoured to oblige heretofore, who have been pleased to express their approbation of his Translations, and who have tried his Secrecy, will recommend and employ him, now that he makes it a Branch of his Profession."⁵⁸ Anthony Fiva, in 1773, also translated "from any one of said languages (French, Spanish, and Italian) into the English, or either of the two others, with accuracy, dispatch, and secrecy for attorneys, merchants, &c."⁵⁹

⁵⁵ *N. Y. Mercury*, May 19, May 26, 1766.

⁵⁶ *N. Y. Gazette*. Revived in the *Weekly Post Boy*, Dec. 4, Dec. 11, Dec. 18, 1749; *ibid.*, Jan. 1, 1750.

⁵⁷ *N. Y. Mercury*, Oct. 7, 1754.

⁵⁸ *N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post Boy*, Oct. 25, Nov. 1, Nov. 15, Nov. 22, 1764.

Ibid., May 12, May 22, 1766.

⁵⁹ *Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer*, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, July 22, Aug. 12, Dec. 9, Dec. 16, 1773; *ibid.*, Dec. 22, 1774. "He copies out writings in the above mentioned languages."

Information concerning the hours of instruction is not abundant. The advertisements indicate that, in most cases, the hours were arranged by agreement between masters and students. The type advertisement contains a statement to the effect that the master "may be spoke with at" his "house," "school," or "academy"; "whoever inclines to learn may apply to" the master "who will agree on reasonable Terms," and "seasonable" hours. "If the Number of Subscribers was sufficient" to "encourage" him, the master might then announce his "public school hours," for those who were willing to become members of mixed classes. John Lewis Mayor, in 1753, announced that "Attendance will be given from Two to Five o'Clock in the Afternoon,"⁶⁰ and Thomas Ross, in 1780, that "he attends from 7 in the morning to 10," three days a week.⁶¹ It is probable that these three hours were "public." Most of the instruction was "private," and the hours were not advertised. For obvious reasons, a master might try to enlarge his "private" classes by inducing a "company," or group of "Ladies," or "Gentlemen" to be "taught together," at a reduced rate.

In addition to the "public," and "private" hours in the schools, many masters seem to have had time for individual or group instruction "abroad." An unknown master, of 1737, announced that "Any Persons that desire to be taught at Home, may be attended at seasonable Hours, provided the Time does not interfere with the Hours of his School."⁶² Instruction of this type must have been very popular; it is probable that many groups of congenial people met together and devoted part of the time to purely social purposes. William Clajon, in 1761, "proposed to wait on Ladies at their Houses if a proper Number of them will meet together,"⁶³ and Michael Bechades, in 1771, would "wait on any Lady or Gentleman in Town at their Houses."⁶⁴

Some of the masters also taught in the evening. The "French

⁶⁰ *N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post Boy*, Nov. 26, Dec. 3, 1753.

⁶¹ *N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, Jan. 10, 1780.

⁶² *N. Y. Weekly Journal*, June 27, July 4, July 25, Aug. 1, 1737.

⁶³ *N. Y. Mercury*, Jan. 26, Nov. 2, 1761.

⁶⁴ *N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, July 22, Aug. 19, 1771.

Ibid., March 2, 1772. Francis Humbert De La Roche also "waited on" people "at their Houses."

Night School" appeared at an early date. John Lewis Mayor, in 1753, taught "from Six to Eight in the Evenings, Saturday excepted."⁶⁵ An advertisement of 1754 informs us that Thomas Ross "began his night school on Monday last at 6 o'clock in the evening."⁶⁶ John Philipse, "teacher of the French Tongue," in 1758, announced that "he will attend . . . every Evening, from the Hour of Five till Eight."⁶⁷

The evidence submitted in the preceding paragraphs indicates that instruction in French occupied a well-established position in the life of colonial New York City. Here and there, we find a record indicating that French was "useful for future Merchants." The advertisements of those masters who "translated for Merchants, Attorneys, &c." give additional evidence of its practical value, and an appreciable number of young men must have studied it with such an end in view. For the most part, however, it is referred to as an accomplishment, and this purpose was emphasized in the advertisements; undoubtedly, most masters preferred to encourage the

⁶⁵ *N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post Boy*, Nov. 26, Dec. 3, 1753.

N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury, Sept. 9, Sept. 16, Sept. 23, 1771. "John Girault . . . Acquaints the Public, That agreeable to his Custom he proposes opening his FRENCH SCHOOL, for the Evenings the 23d Instant September, at 6 o'Clock in the Afternoon."

Ibid., Sept. 7, Sept. 14, Sept. 21, Oct. 12, Oct. 19, 1772.

Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, Sept. 16, Sept. 23, Oct. 7, Oct. 14, 1773. John Girault: "French Night School. . . . Attendance in the evenings from Six to Eight."

Ibid., July 22, Aug. 12, Dec. 9, Dec. 16, 1773; *ibid.*, May 19, May 26, 1774, Anthony Fiva: "evening school from 6 to 8, Saturday excepted."

Ibid., Oct. 6, 1774. Messrs. Gollen and Mountain taught French, among other subjects, "at their Academy." "For such as cannot attend in the day an Evening School will be kept from six to eight."

N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury, Oct. 6, Oct. 13, Oct. 20, 1777. Teniere: "6 to 8 P. M., . . . Saturdays excepted."

⁶⁶ *N. Y. Mercury*, Oct. 7, 1754.

N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury, Sept. 21, 1772. John Haumaid: "Has engaged to open an Evening School, on Monday the 21st of September."

Rivington's N. Y. Gazetteer, or Conn., N. J., H. R., and *Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, Oct. 26, Nov. 9, Nov. 16, 1775. Francis Vandale, who "taught French and other languages," kept "a day and evening school."

⁶⁷ *N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post Boy*, Jan. 30, Feb. 6, Feb. 20, March 6, 1758.

N. Y. Gazette and Weekly Mercury, Jan. 10, 1780. Thomas Egan: "attends . . . in the evening from 5 to 9 o'Clock."

patronage of wealthy pupils. As Simeon and Catherine Lugin stated, in their advertisement of 1774, the "polite French language" was "part of the education of young ladies." An interesting objection to the prevailing practice appeared in the *American Magazine*, May, 1788. It follows:

"In America, female education should have for its object what is useful. Young ladies should be taught to speak and write their own language with purity and elegance; an article in which they are often deficient. The French language is not necessary for ladies. In some cases it is convenient but in general it may be considered as an article of luxury. As an accomplishment, it may be studied by those whose attention is not employed about more important concerns."⁶⁸

Such a criticism enhances the cumulative effect of the evidences of the important rôle played by the French language in the education of the well-to-do of the eighteenth century.

ROBERT FRANCIS SEYBOLT

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

⁶⁸ *The American Magazine*, May, 1788, 367-374.

REVIEWS

Étude sur le Lancelot en prose, par Ferdinand Lot. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, No. 226. Paris (Édouard Champion), 1918.

Anyone who has followed the course of Arthurian discussion will be only too familiar with the part that is played in such studies by hypothetical lost sources, lost versions and the like. In writings of this kind the authors of extant works are seldom credited with any capacity whatever for invention. Especially, for the school of folk-lorists, as Lot remarks in the present volume (p. 236, note 4), "un poète n'a jamais ni talent ni imagination;" it is only the authors of folk-tales—particularly Celtic folk-tales—that are endowed with these blessings, and the poets are generally represented as merely engaged in spoiling the materials which their unknown and unlearned, but more gifted, predecessors have put at their disposal. The facility, indeed, with which the framers of theories concerning the sources of individual romances and the evolution of the cycle (especially, the romances in prose) have set aside the existing texts in favor of hypothetical versions of their own manufacture has too often reduced Arthurian discussion to sterility. One feels as if one were moving in a world of phantoms as baffling as those which one encounters in the romances themselves; for, after all, the extant texts have the first claim to authority, and we have no right to dethrone them in order to put in their places the hypothetical versions of our own fancies, except on the basis of definite, concrete, objective, evidence of the same kind as would be required in the discussion of modern works. Partly under the influence, no doubt, of recent researches in the literature of the *chansons de geste*—above all, of those relating to this subject that are embodied in Bédier's *Légendes Épiques*—there have lately been signs of a reaction, also, in the Arthurian field against the methods that have just been described. Much the most vigorous and elaborate expression of this reaction, however, is the work that lies before us, and, although we may dissent from many of its author's conclusions, we must recognize that the general effect of his book cannot be otherwise than wholesome, in emphasizing the necessity we are all under of first accepting the romances—in this case, the prose romances—as preserved in our manuscripts, at their face value, and making a prolonged and serious effort to discover whether the difficulties they present in respect to structure and details of composition may not, after all, be due to peculiarities of individual workmanship. Too frequently we see our critics, after a hasty inspection of such puzzles, mounting their hippogriffs and taking flight to the land of "lost versions," where they may operate securely beyond the control of mortal vision. As will appear from the following review, in the opinion of the present writer, Professor Lot has gone too far in this reaction, but from any point of view, his treatise is a work of the first importance. It leaves hardly any question relating to the prose romances untouched, and no single work on the Arthurian romances, in general, is fuller of stimulating discussions from new points of view. Moreover, the book abounds in detailed information concerning

the MSS. of the *Lancelot*, which has been lacking heretofore, and Arthurian scholars will note with the liveliest interest that the author speaks of having in preparation another volume which is to be devoted entirely to the MSS. of the Vulgate cycle. The present work possesses, besides, the rare advantage among Arthurian studies of dealing with a comparatively fresh subject; for until the publication of the *Lancelot* (1910-1912) in Sommer's *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances* this romance was virtually a sealed book to the generality of scholars, and there has consequently been relatively little discussion of it.

Lot has summarized (pp. 7 f.) succinctly and clearly the main conclusions of his book in the following words:

"Le corpus *Lancelot-Graal* [i.e., the seven volumes in Sommer's series], déduction faite du *Merlin* et de ses suites [i.e., Sommer's Vols. 2 and 7], qui sont certainement postiches, est dû à un seul auteur. Il présente sous une diversité apparente une unité de conception et de plan certaine. Ce n'est pas l'œuvre romanesque et mystique la plus parfaite du moyen âge français, mais c'en est, à coup sûr, la plus puissante."

The result, thus stated, is startling enough, since all previous students of these romances, however divergent their opinions might be in other respects, have agreed, without exception, that the individual members of the series (barring, possibly, the *Estoire del Saint Graal* and the *Queste del Saint Graal*, devoted, respectively, to the Early History and the Quest of the Holy Grail) were originally the works of different authors and were only subsequently adjusted to each other, in varying degrees, by *assembleurs* or redactors. Furthermore, no one hitherto has doubted that even the central member of the series, *Estoire del Saint Graal* (or *Grand St. Graal*, as scholars, without manuscript authority, have often chosen to call it), *Merlin*, *Lancelot*, *Queste del Saint Graal*, *Mort Artu*—namely, the *Lancelot*—was the work of more than one hand. If current theories, however, are to be rejected, Lot is right in claiming single authorship not merely for the *Lancelot*, but for the whole series, minus the *Merlin* and its continuations; for both allusions and passages of considerable scope, based on the other romances, are so frequent in the *Lancelot*, in the only form in which it has been handed down to us, that one cannot accept that romance in this form as being the (virtually) unaltered original romance, without also accepting the theory of single authorship for the whole series, with the exceptions indicated. But let us note some of the *a priori* improbabilities which this theory involves.¹

According to Lot's conclusions, then, a single author composed this whole series of five volumes in Sommer's edition—that is to say, 1874 large quarto pages, which is more than three times the size of *David Copperfield*—between the end of 1221 and the end of 1225 (cp. p. 140). I will not dwell here on the fact that this dating is certainly erroneous; for Helinand of Froidmont, in the oft-quoted passage of his chronicle, refers distinctly to the *Estoire*. The reference is familiar to all students of the Grail romances, but none of these students appear to have known that Helinand completed his chronicle before 1216 (the year in which King John of England, referred to near the end of the chronicle

¹ In my "The Composition of the Old French Prose *Lancelot*," *ROMANIC REVIEW*, IX, 243 ff. (1918), I have presented more fully already the general objections here recapitulated against the theory of single authorship for the *Lancelot*. These objections, of course, tell with even greater force against the theory of single authorship for the *Estoire*, *Lancelot*, *Queste*, and *Mort Artu*.

as still living, died).² Even if we accepted, however, 1221 as the year in which the supposed author of the *corpus* began his work, it is to be observed that by that year there was no French fiction in prose—unless we choose to put the brief saints' lives in that category—except, possibly, the prose renderings of Robert de Boron's *Joseph* and *Merlin*, both works of quite limited extent.³ Indeed, as is well known, French prose of any kind only commences in the last years of the twelfth century, and by the year mentioned above the only prose work of even moderate length that had been produced in the vernacular was Villehardouin's *Chronicle*, which in N. de Wailly's edition (Paris, 1874) fills only 150 octavo pages—the equivalent of considerably less than 75 pages of Sommer's edition of the prose romances. Moreover, in the subsequent history of European prose fiction there are no works that equal (or surpass) in length the five volumes under discussion, combined, except one or two of the vast French romances of the seventeenth century (*e.g.*, Mlle. Scudéry's *Le Grand Cyrus*).⁴ Now, is it at

² This was pointed out in 1905 in the Introduction, p. xxv (note), to the edition of Helinand's *Vers de la Mort*, by F. Wulff and E. Walberg (Société des anciens textes français). In the *ROMANIC REVIEW*, III, 185 ff. (1912), I called attention to this passage in the Introduction just mentioned, and its great importance for the dating of the prose romances (which Wulff and Walberg had not observed). I used it in correcting my earlier dating of the *Mort Artu*. Lot has evidently overlooked my discussion of these matters. This oversight vitiates, also, his argument as to the date of Robert de Boron's poem, for, of course, the *Estoire* is dependent on the *Joseph*.

³ There are only 1497 lines in the prose rendering of Robert's *Joseph* (cp. G. Weidner's edition, Oppeln, 1881) and 86 pages in that of his *Merlin* (cp. Sommer's series, Vol. 2). G. Paris, *Mélanges de littérature française du moyen âge*, I, 50, expresses the opinion that the *Lancelot* (in an earlier form than that which has been preserved) was the earliest French prose romance. I believe, however, that the prose renderings of Robert are still earlier. Brugger, who also holds the latter view, *Zs. f. frs. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXIX¹, 75 f. (1906), thinks that the author of these renderings adopted the prose form, in order to accentuate the historical character of Robert's narratives. In my opinion, it was the quasi-religious character of Robert's *Joseph* that caused his work to be made the basis of the first prose fiction in French. Up to that time, saints' lives constituted virtually the only French prose.

⁴ According to my calculation, the number of words in *Clarissa Harlowe* (the longest of our English novels) falls slightly short of the number of words in the five volumes under consideration. *Le Grand Cyrus* was in course of publication from 1648 to 1653. The composition of the work consumed probably some six years. The rate of production which is implied in Lot's theory concerning our Arthurian romances cannot be matched in the history of subsequent prose fiction, except, perhaps, in the case of Mlle. Scudéry and of two or three of the most prolific novelists of the nineteenth century, *e.g.*, Dickens, Balzac, Dumas, who, for a period of five years, at the height of their respective activities, may have covered pages with their inventions at equal speed—in the form, of course, of separate works. But these men were writing at a time when the prose of their respective languages had been perfected through centuries of development and its use rendered correspondingly easy. They were also writing under the stimulus of modern literary and commercial conditions.

all likely that the earliest work in Modern European vernacular prose fiction, with the possible exception of the brief prose-readings of Robert de Boron,⁵ was also the longest in all European fiction, barring the seventeenth century romances just indicated? Moreover, as we shall see, not only would the work in question (according to Lot's theory) be of this inordinate length, but it would also be the most intricate in structure of all works of fiction in European literature.

Let us examine, however, the grounds on which Lot bases his conclusion that all four of the "branches" (the term applied in our texts to the various romances of the series) were the productions of a single mind and composed in the execution of a single plan. These are, in the main, three: (1) the systematic interweaving (*entrelacement*) and dovetailing (*enchevêtrement*) of the episodes in the *Lancelot*; (2) the fact that after the fashion of a chronicle the *Lancelot* follows the action of its principal characters from day to day and that it consequently exhibits throughout a systematic chronology;⁶ (3) that a unity of plan and spirit is observable throughout the whole four branches (*Lancelot-Graal corpus*).

Now, with respect to the first of these points—all of which deserve the most serious consideration—it is to be remarked that the peculiarities of construction in question, which, of course, were not wholly original with the *Lancelot* author (or authors)—cp., for instance, Chrétien's *Perceval* and its continuations—although they are far more highly developed in the prose romance, does not conflict with the theory of plural authorship for the *Lancelot*; for, of course, a

⁵ I exclude, also, of course, Latin *novelle*, among which there is even an Arthurian specimen, viz., *De Societate Sadii et Galonis*, in Walter Map's *De Nugis Curialium*, pp. 104 ff. (edition of M. R. James, Oxford, 1914). In her paper, "The Authorship of the *De Ortu Waluuanii* and the *Historia Meriadoci*," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XXIII, 599 ff. (1908), Miss M. S. Morriss has endeavored to sustain Bale's erroneous ascription of these romances to Robert de Torigni, which would put them most probably in the middle of the twelfth century and, consequently, earlier even than any of the extant metrical romances of the Arthurian cycle. In my new edition of these Latin romances (Göttingen and Baltimore, 1913), I have shown, however, that their author indisputably drew on the prose *Tristan*, so, could not have written until far on into the thirteenth century. It is evident that Nitze has not consulted the new edition (which, in the introductory discussions, is largely a new work), nor reflected how completely changed our perspective of the evolution of Arthurian romance would be, if we really possessed Latin romances of this cycle earlier than those which were composed in the vernacular, for in *Modern Philology*, XVII, 163 (1919), he accepts Miss Morriss's results, as if they had never been called into question.

⁶ From Geoffroy down, Whitsuntide (Pentecost) had been the great festival at Arthur's court and furnished a sort of *point de repère* for Arthurian chronology. The chronology of the *Lancelot*, as Lot's own discussion shows, is not wholly exact. Space fails us to discuss in detail this part of Lot's work. Surely, however, the author of the *Lancelot*, III, 118, would not look up the church calendars to discover in what year of the fifth century (actually 428) St. John's Day came on a Sunday. (Cp. Lot, pp. 61 f.) Is not this accidental? Our author, himself, acknowledges (pp. 63 f.) that only in the *Lancelot* is there anything like a systematic chronology.

continuator would adopt such obvious structural devices from the work he was continuing, especially as these devices, to a considerable extent, are of a kind that would naturally suggest themselves to any writer whose narrative embraced more than one prominent character.

As regards the intricacy of this interweaving and dovetailing, there are two remarks to be made: (1) The fact that a narrative fits perfectly with a preceding narrative does not mean necessarily that the two are from the same hand. The *Charrette* episode in the *Lancelot*, itself, proves this. Suppose that Chrétien's *Lancelot* had been lost, who would have been able to tell that the story of Lancelot's cart-adventures and the Bohort episodes that are so skillfully interwoven with these adventures in the prose *Lancelot* were, in origin, separate inventions of different writers? Yet such, we know, was the case. We see the same thing, moreover, exemplified (with somewhat less skill) in the union of the Claudas story (at the beginning of the romance) with that of the *Lanselet* (in its lost French form). This observation might very well apply, for instance, not only to the above-mentioned Bohort episodes, but to still other adventures in the same part of the *Lancelot*, cited by Lot (p. 23) as proofs of unity of authorship. A continuator could do this kind of thing as well as the author of the earlier part of the romance. (2) Anticipatory references to, or passages preparing for, still other passages that lie hundreds of pages ahead, and the counterpart of these things, viz., the resumption of episodes that have been dropped hundreds of pages further back, themselves, excite suspicion. There is absolutely nothing like this in all European fiction, outside of the *Lancelot-Graal corpus*. Now, is it likely that in the very infancy of prose fiction (as far as the modern nations are concerned)—indeed, in the very infancy of French prose—we should find a work of this *genre* plotted on a vaster and more intricate scale than any in the most highly developed periods of the literary art? Take, for example, the part that Claudas plays in the *Lancelot*. After disinheriting Lancelot, he drops out of the narrative at I, 104, and only appears again at V, 256, where, in wars that Lancelot undertook against him, in order to revenge an insult to Guinivere, he is dispossessed of his ill-gotten dominions. Now, there lie between these passages 944 of Sommer's large octavo pages—that is to say, a narrative which contains not very far from twice as many words as one of Dickens' long novels, e.g., *David Copperfield* or *Martin Chuzzlewit*. How can one believe that an author deliberately postponed to such a distance the conclusion of the original episode, filling up the intervening space with desultory adventures of every imaginable kind, many of which are the veriest trash—and all this, as was said above, in the very infancy of prose fiction? It is to be noted, too, that the earlier narrative concerning Claudas is one of the strongest things in mediaeval French prose, whilst the later one falls far below this level—moreover, that the character appears in the latter with an illegitimate son (very prominent in this later narrative), of whom nothing had been said before, and with the Lady of the Lake completely stripped of her supernatural traits.

Passages of this kind, some consisting of a mere line, others of whole episodes, referring by anticipation to the *Mort Artu* (as well as to the *Queste*, which follows immediately upon the *Lancelot*), are so frequent in the last division of the *Lancelot* (the so-called *Agravain*) that the writer must have already had that branch pretty well mapped out, even in detail, in his mind, and yet, according to

Lot's theory, he composed the intervening *Queste*, a long romance of a totally different character, before taking up this final branch (*Mort Artu*).

Lot regards such features of the Lancelot-Graal *corpus* as simply due to a single author's methods of composition, and in his Second Chapter he cites examples drawn from the *Lancelot*, in some of which the passages that interrupt the narrative concerning particular characters are long, though not of such length as we have noted above in the case of the narrative relating to Claudas. It does not seem to us, however, that the examples cited by our author are all on the same footing. Thus the delay in the revealing of Lancelot's name is merely an exaggeration of the trick which the author of the *Lancelot* found in his primary source, the French original of the German *Lanzelet*. In each the character concerned, the hero of the romance, is kept constantly before the reader, and, although one may think that the trick is abused, there is nothing unnatural about it; but it is different when we have the name of Trahan le Gai held back for 300 pages after the character had been apparently dropped from the story (III, 208), and finally made known in a passage which is inconsistent with the former in respect to that personage's age and which does not fulfill the original promise (III, 199) of relating how he got his wounds. Again, the excellent scene between Lancelot and Guinivere (V, 192 ff.) in which the latter learns that her lover cannot win the Grail, because of his sin with her, is connected by its author with the churchyard adventure (IV, 340) in which Gawain fails; but one cannot say with Lot (p. 26) that the latter was written for the special purpose of preparing the way for the former; the scene is sufficiently justified simply as one of the systematic attempts which we find made everywhere in the *Lancelot* to exalt the hero over Gawain and other knights, who are represented as failing in adventures which Lancelot is later destined to achieve.

As regards the second of Lot's grounds for his theory of single authorship—the more or less systematic chronology of the *Lancelot*—the same observation applies here as in the case of the first. If the author of what has been currently accepted as the first division of the *Lancelot*—the so-called *Galehaut*—was accustomed to give with fair consistency chronological indications as to the course of the action, it would be quite natural for any one who was carrying on his work to do the same thing. These indications, after all, are not so numerous that it would require any great effort on the part of either the original author or his (hypothetical) continuators to preserve a tolerable consistency in introducing them.

The third of the grounds for the new theory, viz., a supposed unity of plan and spirit (including style) that runs through the whole Lancelot-Graal *corpus*, suggests, also, difficulties. For example, the *Lancelot* in the *Galehaut* and *Charrette* sections, and in the earlier portions of the *Agravain*, represents, without reservations, the spirit of the *amour courtois*, often in its most extravagant forms; moreover, in parts, it is brutally licentious. On the other hand, there is no work in mediaeval literature that adopts more uncompromisingly the point of view of a rigid asceticism than the *Queste*. Lot, however, points (pp. 95 ff.) to various passages in the *Lancelot*—allegorical dreams, moral exhortations of different personages, etc.—as proving an identity of spirit throughout the series. Most of these passages, however, stand in such striking contrast to their surroundings that they have hitherto quite naturally been set down as inter-

polations. They accord perfectly with the spirit of the *Queste* or the *Estoire*, but not at all with that of the *Lancelot*. In answer to this, Lot still further cites Chrétien and Wauchier de Denain as examples of authors who turned their hands with equal readiness to the composition of secular or religious narratives. But rattling off saints' lives in facile verse is a very different matter from composing a work of profound mysticism like the *Queste*, which, as should be remembered, has made a more permanent impression on the imagination of the world than any other single production of the mystical spirit of the Middle Ages. The author of stories of rape (such as we find in certain passages of the *Lancelot*), told in detail with evident gusto, and of still other stories, based on inanities of the *amour courtois*, could not have put on with the ease of a new garment this mantle of a mystical moralist, who, in his own way, was as stern as Torquemada.

The idea that the five volumes show a unity of plan, furthermore, is open to objections. Here are just a few of them: Lot makes a great deal of the latter part of the *Lancelot* being written before the *Queste*, in order to prepare the reader for the story of the *Queste*. But the *Agravain* (as the concluding part of the *Lancelot* is called), if we accept the text as it has come down to us, prepares the reader not only for the *Queste*, but for the *Mort Artu*, which lies beyond the *Queste*. On the other hand, there is in the *Queste*, itself, no preparation whatever made for the *Mort Artu*, which comes immediately after it in the series; indeed, this branch does not contain a line to show that its author was planning the *Mort Artu*, although there was every reason for him to insert anticipatory references to that romance, since it was in this final branch that the fatal consequences of Lancelot's sin with Guinevere (the sin against which the *Queste* inveighs so mercilessly) are set forth. The explanation of these conditions seems manifest: The *Queste* was originally an independent romance, whose author had no intention of writing a *Mort Artu*, and the passages in question in the *Agravain* were composed later than the *Mort Artu* and the *Queste* for the purpose of connecting the *Lancelot* with these branches, just as the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation was later composed to connect Robert's *Merlin* with the *Lancelot*. The author of the *Mort Artu*, himself, seems to have been plainly responsible for some, at least, of the passages.

With respect to this idea of the unity of the plan, it is to be observed still further that the end of the *Agravain*, in important respects, does not harmonize at all with the beginning of the *Queste*, which comes immediately after it. For instance, at the end of the *Agravain* (V, 408) Lancelot goes frequently to see Galahad at the nunnery, where the latter is being reared; at the beginning of the *Queste* (VI, 3 f.) less than two pages further on in Sommer's edition, he knows nothing of the nunnery and is unable to recognize Galahad. Lot makes light of such inconsistencies,⁷ and endeavors to explain many of them (often satisfactorily) as characteristic of the workmanship of a single author; but to ascribe to any rational human being such flatly contradictory conceptions in regard to fundamental matters occurring within the space of two pages, as in the instance just noted, seems to us impossible. In the text of an ancient or a modern author,

⁷ Cp. especially Chapter VIII and Appendix IV. I do not believe, however, that the conflicting stories about King Label, dealt with in the latter, were both in the *Estoire*, in its original form.

no one would think of accepting such absurdities as genuine, and the present writer does not believe that we have any more right to impute them to a mediaeval author.⁸

Among the numerous other inconsistencies between the *Lancelot* and the *Queste* is to be noted the fact that when Bohort visits the Grail castle in the crowning adventure of the *Queste*, there is no intimation that he had been at this castle twice before in the *Agravain*—indeed, on one of these previous visits had spent two nights there in succession. And, for similar inconsistencies within the *Lancelot*, itself, observe the discrepancy that on Gawain's visit to the Grail castle (IV, 339 ff.) the Maimed King is lord of the castle and Pelles is not mentioned, but on Lancelot's visit (V, 105 ff.) the conditions are just reversed.

Again, it is a hard saying when Lot asserts that a unity of style prevails throughout the five volumes. To be sure, there are no obvious differences in vocabulary and sentence-structure between the branches, but the same thing is true of the *Merlin* continuations (as compared with the *Lancelot-Graal corpus*), which Lot rightly regards as of later composition, and, besides, no close study of the subject has as yet been made. From every other point of view, however, the differences of style in different parts of the *corpus* are enormous. Indeed, we have almost every conceivable variety of style within the limits of the five volumes—differences between the finer parts, and, of course, still greater differences between the finer and the inferior parts. For instance, contrast, as examples of the former, the wars of Claudas, the scenes depicting Lionel's childhood, the love-scenes between Lancelot and Guinevere (all in the so-called *Galahad* section of the *Lancelot*) with the scene in the *Queste* where Galahad achieves the Grail quest, or the splendid epic of Arthur's last battle and translation in the *Mort Artu*. On the other hand, compare with these the pages of rubbish which follow on the *Charrette* section of the *Lancelot* (Bohort's adventures, large portions of the quest for Lancelot which commences at IV, 321) and the anaemic conclusion of that branch, V, 377 ff. (beginning with Perceval's first appearance in the story.)

These are just a few of the objections to Lot's theory of single authorship. For want of space we shall have to refer the reader to *ROMANIC REVIEW*, IX, 243 ff., for the evidence which the present writer has there set forth to show that, on the other hand, there is nothing arbitrary in assuming that the *Lancelot* of our MSS. is an expanded form of an earlier and simpler romance, having suffered, we may reasonably conjecture, the same fate as, we know, befell the prose *Tristan*, which still exists in a non-cyclic, as well as a cyclic form.⁹ The

⁸ See, still further, on these passages, *ROMANIC REVIEW*, X, 114 ff. (1919).

⁹ The frequent *rifacimenti* of the different branches of the cycle show how little compunction the romancers felt in trying to supplant existing versions with versions of their own. Cp. the three different *Merlin* continuations, the various redactions of the *Mort Arthur* theme, which I have enumerated in my edition of the *Mort Artu*, pp. viii ff. (Halle, 1910), and so on. Note, too, such additional evidence as follows, pointing to an earlier form of the *Lancelot* than that which is preserved in our MSS.: (1) The opening of the *Agravain*: "Chi endroit dist li contes que quant Agreuains se fu partis de sez compaignons si com vous aues oi quil erra. ij. iours sans aventure," etc. But in the extant MSS. of the *Lancelot Agravain* had not been mentioned, so something must have been lost. Lot's

argument there in favor of the composite origin of the *Lancelot* tells, of course, with even greater force in favor of the composite origin of the whole *corpus*. The above-mentioned evidence, in its main points, is virtually left out of consideration by Lot.

According to Lot's theory, the *Queste* and the *Mort Artu* were composed in succession after the completion of the *Lancelot*, in just the form in which it survives to us in our MSS. He accepts, however, as due to the author of the *Lancelot* himself, the passages which are found in certain MSS. of Part I of that branch, viz., Sommer, III, 28 f. (majority of the extant MSS.), and III, 429 (two or three MSS.), and which imply that Perceval, not Galahad, was to be the hero of the Grail quest. But both in the *Estoire*, which stands at the head of the series, and in the beginning of the *Lancelot*, itself, as everywhere else in the *corpus*, except in the passages just named (in the MSS. referred to), Galahad is the Grail Winner. To get around this discrepancy, Lot advances the theory (p. 122) that when the author of the *corpus* wrote Vol. I of the *Lancelot*, he had not invented Galahad, and that, under the influence of the Didot *Perceval*,¹⁰ Perceval still was for him the Grail Winner, but that, after composing Vol. I, and (apparently) a part of Vol. 2, he invented Galahad, stopped his work on the *Lancelot*, and composed the *Estoire*, of which up to this time he had merely carried a vague notion in his head and in which Galahad is the predestined Grail Winner—then proceeded to the completion of the *Lancelot* and the rest of the *corpus*.

I confess that these speculations of Lot's, to my mind, fail to carry conviction. To break off the composition of one huge romance in order to go back and compose another introductory romance, which was three or four

explanation (p. 12) of the division in the *Lancelot* at this point is otherwise satisfactory, but, it does not account for the unsatisfactory opening. (2) We have no right to question the existence of the romance on Helain le Blanc ("l'estoire de sa vie"), to which reference is made in the *Lancelot*, IV, 27. The author had no motive whatever for hoaxing his readers here. But Helain is the son of Bohort and Brangoire's daughter, characters that were invented by the author (or one of the authors) of the *Lancelot*, and so a romance about their son must have been later than the original *Lancelot*—yet here in our texts we have reference to this (lost) romance. I have discussed the passage more fully, ROMANIC REVIEW, IX, 355 ff. (3) Lot (cp. p. 109) gives no consideration to the statement at the end of Part I of the *Lancelot* (Sommer, III, 429), which is found in nearly all of the MSS.: "Et li contes Lancelot fu branche del Graal, si com il y fut adjoustes." This certainly implies that the *Lancelot* was once separate from the Grail romances and we have no reason to interpret "li contes Lancelot" as referring to Chrétien's poem or the French *Lanzelet*, rather than to the prose *Lancelot*.

¹⁰ Lot formerly regarded the Didot *Perceval* as a late work. He now renounces (p. 133, note 2) that opinion and refers to this romance throughout his treatise as if it was the prose rendering of a lost metrical *Perceval* by Robert de Boron. Robert, however, in his *Joseph* and *Merlin*, never mentions Perceval, and there is no convincing reason to believe that he ever wrote a romance about that hero. I have ready for the press a study on this subject, which, I trust, may re-convert Monsieur Lot.

times as long as any French prose work then in existence, seems a strange enough procedure. If the author of the *Lancelot* did this, he must have, also, altered the beginning of this branch (the *Lancelot*), for the passages, III, 3, 13, already represent Galahad as the intended Grail Winner just as clearly as anything in the *Estoire*. And if he made such alterations as these in his revision of the *Lancelot*, why did he leave the obnoxious passages about Perceval standing?

As a matter of fact, it is only the passage, III, 28 f. that has sufficient MS. support to possess anything approaching authority, and there, rack our brains as we may, there is no possible explanation of this corrupt and difficult passage—an unstable basis, surely, for any far-reaching theory—except that the confusion in the MS. tradition is due to interpolation and to scribal blundering. Lot thinks (p. 112) that the reading of MS. 768 (Bib. Nat.) makes everything straight. Usually in the MSS., in the passage under consideration, whether Galahad or Perceval is named as the Grail Winner, we have the absurdity of the hero's mother being spoken of just three lines further on as his sister. MS. 768, however, not only makes Perceval the Grail Winner, but makes him and his sister children of Pelles (who, in contradiction to the general conception of the *corpus*, is here called the Maimed King). So, according to this MS., it is Perceval's sister who is named "Amide en sornon et an son droit non Heliabel." MS. 768, thus, gives a reading which is free from the absurdity, just mentioned, of the great majority of the MSS. Nevertheless, *pace* Lot, the reading of this MS. represents obviously nothing but an individual scribe's emendation, such as we find also in MS. 110 (Bib. Nat.). For, in all Arthurian romance, only in this passage and in this MS. and MS. 118 (with its dependent Arsenal 3479)—the latter, it may be, closely affiliated with the former—is Perceval represented as the son of Pelles, or his sister, who is a prominent character in more than one romance, called either *Amide* (*Amite*) or *Heliabel*. Lot makes no comment at all on the double naming found in all MSS. at this point—"Amide en sornon et an son droit non Heliabel"—but this double naming is not haphazard; it can only belong to the Galahad *Queste*: Lancelot's baptismal name, as we are told, III, 3, was *Galahad*, i.e., a name with religious associations, but he lost it on account of his carnal sin (with Guinevere), and he received then a secular name, *Lancelot*. As an exact counterpart of this, Galahad's mother (III, 28 f.), also, bore originally a name with sacred associations, viz., *Heliabel* (*Helisabet*, name of John the Baptist's mother); but when she lost her virginity (to Lancelot), she, too, received a secular name, *Amide* (*Amite*).¹¹

The passage, then, we must conclude, related originally to Galahad—or, as the present writer would say, it was a Galahad interpolation, like so many others in the *Lancelot*—and Galahad's name, not Perceval's, must have stood originally in it as the name of the Grail Winner that was to be. But, of course, Galahad's mother could not have been his sister, too, so the words, *cele fu sa suer*, must be wrong. I have no doubt, myself, that *suer* here is a blunder in the archetype for *mere*. Either the writer (in my judgment, an interpolator) or, more probably, the scribe of our archetype, in taking up the description of Galahad's mother (with especial reference to her beauty), which he had dropped three

¹¹ Cp. the fuller discussion of these matters in *ROMANIC REVIEW*, IX, 250, 256 ff. (1918).

sentences back, in order to indicate Galahad's future achievements, commits this *lapsus calami*, which passes on into the general MS. tradition, although, in some MSS., attempts were afterwards made to emend it.

The assumption here of a blunder in the archetype with subsequent attempts to emend, is not so arbitrary as may appear at first sight, for there are undeniable instances of this in our MS. tradition of the Arthurian romances.¹²

As far as the name *Perlesvaus* (*Perlesvaus*, etc.)—that is to say, *Perceval*—which is found here in so many MSS., is concerned, since it stands, as the name of the Grail Winner, virtually in this one passage of the *Lancelot*, we are forced to conclude that this, too, must have got into the tradition of such MSS. through a scribal error, after the blunder, *suer* for *mere*, had been established in that tradition; for, as stated above, that blunder is found in the passage under discussion in the MSS. which make Perceval the Grail Winner as well as in those which give that honor to Galahad. The second blunder involved, viz., the erroneous substitution of Perceval for Galahad here probably came about as follows: Before Galahad was invented as the hero of the Grail quest, Perceval, of course, held that position—to-wit, in Chrétien's *Perceval* and its continuations. Moreover, if the passage before us was, as I believe, a late Galahad interpolation, a scribe, transcribing it, would probably know of him (Perceval), still further, as the Grail Winner in the *Perlesvaus*, and, possibly, the Didot *Perceval*.¹³ With some or all of these romances dimly in mind, he might easily, through inadvertence, substitute Perceval's name for that of Galahad, whose name does not occur often enough in this part of the *Lancelot* to have kept itself vividly before the copyist's mind. In fact, is it not likely that many a scribe copied parts of this vast series without having any but the most superficial acquaintance with the other parts?

Owing to considerations of space, we have been able to deal only with the main thesis of this highly interesting volume. This thesis, being from the hand of a scholar who has rendered such eminent services to Arthurian research, is sure to provoke the most wide-spread discussion and will, doubtless, mark an epoch in the study of the prose-romances. There are additional chapters, however, that treat of other aspects of the *corpus*, such as the date of its composition,¹⁴ the social status of its author (probably a court chaplain), the part of France he belonged to,¹⁵ his sources and methods of workmanship, the merits and demerits of the work (an excellent chapter), and its fortunes with posterity—still further, appendices that offer successively an analysis (63 pages) of

¹² Cp. *Modern Philology*, XVI, 123 f., including note 1.

¹³ Notice that the form of the name, in the passage under discussion, viz., *Perlesvaus*, etc., is not found in the MSS. of the parts of the *corpus* where Perceval is an actor, and suggests the influence of the *Perlesvaus*. Cp. *ROMANIC REVIEW*, IV, 468 ff. (1913).

¹⁴ Cp. p. 378 above.

¹⁵ Lot (p. 150) thinks that he belonged to Meaux, because once in the *Estoire* and once in the *Mort Artu* that town is mentioned, where there seems no occasion for it in the context. In a recent article, "Mordrain, Corbenic, and the Vulgate Grail Romances," *Modern Language Notes* for November, 1919, I have argued, however, in favor of Corbie as the place of origin of the *Estoire* and *Queste*, on the basis of a somewhat more definite piece of evidence than that which Lot cites in favor of Meaux.

the narrative of the whole *corpus*, discussions of Claudas' name, of the King Label episode of the *Estoire*, of a (supposed first) redaction of the false Guinevere episode, of the *Charrette* episode in Chrétien's poem and the prose *Lancelot*, respectively, and of woman in the *Queste*. These last two appendices do not consist of technical discussions, like most of the book, but are charming literary essays from the pen of Mme. Lot-Borodine, the well-known author of *Le roman idyllique au moyen âge*. Finally, eight pages of "Additions et corrections" at the end of the volume bring the work up to date.

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

La Bella Mano di Giusto de' Conti. Edited by Giuseppe Gigli. Lanciano, G. Carabba, 1916.

Giusto de' Conti, Il Canzoniere. Prima edizione completa, a cura di Leonardo Vitetti. Lanciano, R. Carabba, 1918. Two vols.

Giusto de' Conti has enjoyed a somewhat shadowy fame in literary histories as the first writer of the Quattrocento to compose an entire *canzoniere* on the Petrarchan model. The result, entitled *La Bella Mano* after the fair hand of his beloved, met prompt popularity and soon found its way into print, the first edition dating from 1472, and others steadily following to the end of the eighteenth century. During the nineteenth, the scattered publications added numerous poems to the original nucleus, there was no complete reprint; but of late, with the unfortunate tendency to duplication of effort which sometimes marks Italian scholarship, two editions have appeared close together in both space and time. The first, that of Gigli, which merely reprints the original *Bella Mano* without the later pieces, adds nothing to our knowledge, and little to our convenience, since the second gives us not only the whole body of Giusto's known work, a total of 220 poems, but also much useful illustrative material. It therefore is the one which calls for serious consideration.

It begins with a brief preface defining Giusto's position in literature, and proceeds with a number of *indicazioni*: Giusto's birthplace; the year of his birth, about 1390; certain of his friends; the manuscripts, of which the Ashburnham Laurenziano 1714 is the most authoritative; the nine editions from the Bologna *princeps* to the Veronese of 1753; the arrangement of the present edition; and a bibliography of the chief articles on Giusto and his work. Then follows the text, in three divisions: the *Bella Mano* itself, a series of fifty-four additional sonnets, and a section of *rime sparse*, comprising two canzoni, a mutilated sestina, a ballata, and sundry sonnets. There are also included sonnets addressed to Giusto by other poets, and, as appendix, some notes on Giusto's life by Nicola Ratti, first published at Rome in 1824. Nothing of what is needed for a full understanding of Giusto's work is lacking, and the only defect from the point of view of a reader's convenience is the absence of an index of first lines.

A note on the variations between the new edition and its predecessors may be of some use. The order is in general the same; but five sonnets are shifted, nos. 18, 43, 38, 39, and 40 of the older editions being respectively nos. 136, 37, 141, 150, and 139 in Vitetti. He also relegates to the *rime sparse* the old nos. 41 and 42 (his 212 and 211), filling their places with two others: 137, *Tant'è possente il mio fiero disio*, and 140, *S'ell'è natural vostro o ver costume*.

Thus the total number of poems in part I remains the same, tho the figures run to 151, since the scribe of the Ashburnham manuscript included as 138 a sonnet not by Giusto but addressed to him. The text, it may be said, does not profess to be critical, and gives little in the way of variants.

A critical text, indeed, might be thought a waste of labor; yet the work of Giusto and his fellows, if it is not of high poetic merit, does not lack occasional pleasant passages, and is in any case significant as revealing the taste of the time, and as forming a chain of production which bridges the interval between Petrarch and Lorenzo de' Medici. To have maintained the tradition of vernacular poetry in the face of the Neo-Latin of the Humanists was no small achievement; and those who performed it deserve something better than neglect. Such an edition as the present affords a chance to ascertain the precise way in which Giusto utilized Dante and Petrarch, and the extent to which he was affected by the more realistic trend initiated by Fazio degli Uberti. Giusto, as a representative figure, undoubtedly merits a separate edition; if lesser poets seem not to do so, the interests of accurate study could be largely served by the diplomatic publication of the largest and best manuscripts containing Trecento and early Quattrocento work, as has been done for the poets of the Dugento and of the *dolce stil nuovo*. It would be well if some of the effort which goes into the production of unnecessary editions of the familiar classics could be turned in this direction.

CHARLES E. WHITMORE

NORTHAMPTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Tutte le Opere di Dante Alighieri, novamente rivedute, con un copiosissimo indice del contenuto di esse. Firenze, G. Barbèra, 1919.

Appearing seven years after its inception, and three after the death of its editor, this Italian counterpart of the Oxford Dante may claim some indulgence if it falls short of perfection. The publishers, finding it hard, as they gracefully say, to improve on its predecessor, have sought to give more. This additional material appears partly in the text, partly in the index; and its value for the better understanding of Dante is the criterion by which the new edition must be judged.

So far as concerns the text, we have some additions in the letters, and still more in the miscellaneous lyrics. In the former are given the allusions to letters now lost contained in the various early biographers, and the three doubtful letters written in the name of the Countess of Battifolle; the allusions are convenient, the doubtful letters at least harmless. But the treatment of the lyrics offers ground for serious complaint, by the inclusion of numerous doubtful pieces, and the lack of any indication of manuscript sources to assist the reader in judging the validity of the attributions, in some cases doubtful enough.

The arrangement of this section of the volume is chronological, the main outline being naturally provided by the scheme of the *Vita Nuova*, with reference to its poems in the appropriate places. Around them are fitted the attested miscellaneous lyrics, and others of more than doubtful authenticity, like the anonymous canzoni in the Vaticano 3213, and *Lo doloroso amor che mi conduce*. It is a gain to have *O patria degna di trionfal fama* removed; but why should Cecchi's *Morte, poich'io non trovo a cui mi doglia* still stand, without even a

question mark? It would have been permissible to put these doubtful pieces in an appendix, as is indeed here done with *Il Fiore*, thought by some to be a genuine early work; but the mixture of authentic and uncertain poems must be misleading to the untrained reader, and irritating to the scholar. It is matter for surprise and regret that no one has ever edited all the scattering pieces ascribed to Dante, with discussion of the manuscript evidence, on the model of Solerti's *Rime disperse del Petrarca*; in the absence of such a work we are reduced to drawing conclusions from scattered data. If uncertain pieces had at all cost to be given, why not have included the canzone *Era in quel giorno che l'alta reina*, which is at least consistently *stil nuovo* in technique, and in poetic merit far beyond the other uncertain pieces? We are told that the deceased editor based his choice and arrangement on "criteria molto personali"; it is unfortunate that he did not live to expound and justify them. Yet even if he had, there would remain room for doubt whether results based on such criteria should be given a place in a volume designed for the general public. On the other hand, the placing all the poetic correspondence in a section by itself is a convenience; tho here too some conjectural matter enters, as with sundry sonnets of Cino's which are not certainly addressed to Dante.

As for the index, which the publishers extol as the most remarkable feature of the book, one must likewise feel some reserve. Tho alphabetically continuous, it includes two classes of material. One is a list of proper names, with brief comment, generally of this order: *Abraam, patriarca ebreo; Nerone, imperatore romano*; in some cases, as that of Crassus, there is no descriptive phrase at all. It is hard to see wherein this is more useful than Dr. Toynbee's index in the Oxford Dante. The other is a list of philosophical terms, with rather brief definitions. This, had it been carried further, would have had genuine utility; but the treatment is at best sketchy, at worst incomplete. Under *accidente*, for instance, we are referred to *predicamenti*; but there is no such article. Here, too, accomplishment falls between the stools of a desire for inclusiveness and the lack of a sound method.

It therefore does not appear that this edition shows any real advance in scholarship, or confers any real advantage on the study of Dante, especially as it abounds in misprints, by no means all accounted for in the table of Errata. All in all, it is unfortunate that the effort which has gone into its production could not have been better applied.

CHARLES E. WHITMORE

NORTHAMPTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 007 087 021

CECIL H. GREEN LIBRARY
STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(650) 723-1493
grncirc@sulmail.stanford.edu
All books are subject to recall.

DATE DUE

JUN 26 2001
JUN 26 2001

100-100-100-100